

# **The American Journalism of MARX & ENGELS**

Edited by Henry M. Christman/Introduction by Charles Blitzer



In 1851 Karl Marx, then living destitute in London with his wife and children, accepted an offer from Charles A. Dana, editor of the New York *Daily Tribune*, to serve as foreign correspondent for the paper. During the next decade, some 500 articles by Marx and Engels were prominently featured in the most influential newspaper in America, winning high repute and providing Marx with his sole source of regular income. Now, for the first time, the most significant of these pieces have been collected in book form. A fascinating chapter in journalistic history, they stand as the products of truly extraordinary intellects that gave bold illumination to the world of the nineteenth century.

The complex of subjects falling under scrutiny by Marx and Engels ranges wide: the German revolution of 1848; British rule in India; Russian pan-slavism; the inroads of Western colonialism in China; the attitude of England toward the United States and the Confederacy during the opening phase of the Civil War; and other topics, many pregnant with import for the future. The reader may be surprised to find these studies marked not by the narrow dogmatism often found in latter-day "Marxists," but by a searching objectivity, an attempt to comprehend the central

(continued on back flap)

(continued from front flap)

core of truth in the events and personalities under examination. Also perhaps surprising is the deep affection with which Marx and Engels regarded the United States, viewing it as an inspiring achievement in social progress.

Particularly noteworthy is how well these works have stood the test of time, how attuned they are to contemporary perspective. As Charles Blitzer writes in his Introduction: "In an age when men generally were all too ready to accept at face value politicians' own explanations of their acts and motives, it was no mean achievement to suggest—with evidence—that the truth is often much more complex.... If a preoccupation with the sociological and economic background of politics and a determination to uncover the real motives that lie behind the words of politicians and governments are the hallmarks of modern political journalism, Karl Marx may properly be said to be its father."

COVER DESIGN/S.A. SUMMIT, INC.



**THE NEW AMERICAN LIBRARY**

1301 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10019

PUBLISHERS OF SIGNET, SIGNET CLASSICS,

AND MENTOR BOOKS

# **The American Journalism of MARX & ENGELS**

---

A SELECTION FROM  
THE NEW YORK DAILY TRIBUNE

Edited by

Henry M. Christman

Introduction by Charles Blitzer



THE NEW AMERICAN LIBRARY



Copyright © 1966 by Henry M. Christman

Introduction Copyright © 1966 by The New American Library, Inc.

Appendix Copyright © 1966 by Louis Lazarus

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced  
without written permission from the publishers.

First Printing

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 66-26045

Published by The New American Library, Inc.

1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10019

Published simultaneously in Canada by

General Publishing Company, Ltd.

Printed in the United States of America

# Contents

---

|                                                                                                          |      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Introduction by Charles Blitzer                                                                          | vii  |
| Editor's Preface                                                                                         | xxix |
| (Germany at the Outbreak of the Revolution of<br>1848)                                                   | 1    |
| (The Prussian State)                                                                                     | 12   |
| (The Other German States)                                                                                | 24   |
| (Austria)                                                                                                | 30   |
| (The Vienna Insurrection)                                                                                | 38   |
| (The Berlin Insurrection)                                                                                | 43   |
| Corruption at Elections                                                                                  | 49   |
| Elections—Financial Clouds—The Duchess of<br>Sutherland and Slavery                                      | 57   |
| Parliamentary Debates—The Clergy and the<br>Struggle for the Ten-Hour Day—Starvation                     | 66   |
| Forced Emigration—Kossuth and Mazzini—The<br>Refugee Question—Election Bribery in England<br>—Mr. Cobden | 74   |
| Revolution in China and in Europe                                                                        | 83   |
| The British Rule in India                                                                                | 93   |
| The Future Results of the British Rule in India                                                          | 102  |
| Palmerston                                                                                               | 110  |

|                                                                                                          |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| England and Russia                                                                                       | 126 |
| Lord John Russell                                                                                        | 137 |
| (China and Russia)                                                                                       | 154 |
| (Torture as a Financial Institution in British India)                                                    | 158 |
| (British Income from India)                                                                              | 165 |
| The Approaching Indian Loan                                                                              | 170 |
| The Indian Bill                                                                                          | 175 |
| (Opium or Commerce?)                                                                                     | 180 |
| (The Chinese Market)                                                                                     | 185 |
| The British and Chinese Treaty                                                                           | 192 |
| The New Chinese War (I)                                                                                  | 199 |
| The New Chinese War (II)                                                                                 | 206 |
| The American Question in England                                                                         | 211 |
| The British Cotton Trade                                                                                 | 223 |
| The London <i>Times</i> on the Orleans Princes in<br>America                                             | 228 |
| The News and Its Effects in London                                                                       | 234 |
| Progress of Feeling in England                                                                           | 241 |
| English Public Opinion                                                                                   | 247 |
| Appendix (List of Marx & Engels articles in the<br>New York Daily Tribune prepared by Louis<br>Lazarus.) | 255 |

# Introduction

---

## I

The story of Karl Marx's American journalism may be said to have begun in the summer of 1849 when Marx, who was living in Cologne and editing the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, a radical newspaper, was arrested on a charge of incitement to treason. The accusation, based upon articles and editorials that Marx had written during the hectic last days of the 1848 Revolution in Germany, seemed reasonable enough in the light of Marx's vehement opposition to the Prussian government and his demand that workers and democrats refuse to pay taxes imposed by it. There seemed every reason to suppose that the solid middle-class jury would find him guilty as charged. But with his remarkable gift for making the best of any opportunities that presented themselves for spreading the gospel of socialism, Marx took the occasion of his trial to deliver a long and masterly analysis of the political situation in Germany and abroad. He argued that all laws must reflect social realities and that when social realities change, as they had in Germany in 1848, laws must also change or become obsolete; thus, he concluded, it was the government of Prussia that had deserted its subjects, not its subjects who had subverted their government. To the considerable surprise of everyone concerned, and to the consternation of the Prussian authorities, Marx's performance was so effective that the jury not only acquitted him, but went out of its way to thank him for his most enlightening lecture. It is no wonder that the government, which was powerless to reverse the verdict,

should have been determined to remove from its territory so formidable an antagonist. In July, Marx was officially expelled from the Rhineland, as he had been expelled from Belgium the year before and from France in 1845. After a brief sojourn in Paris, where he was informed by the French police that he must either retire to the marshes of Brittany or leave the country, Marx crossed the English Channel and arrived in London on August 24, 1849. He expected to stay in England only until political developments on the Continent should make it possible for him to return. In fact he remained in London until his death in 1883.

Friedrich Engels once observed that the three great components of Marxism are German philosophy, French socialism, and English economics. What is striking is the way in which Marx's biography corresponds to this same trinational pattern. As Marx devoted himself systematically to the mastery of these three bodies of thought and analysis, immersing himself in each in turn, he traveled from his native Germany to France and then to England. Thus his exile from the Continent marks a turning point not only in the external circumstances of his life, but also in his intellectual development.

Although Marx was only thirty-one when he settled in England, he had already established himself as a serious philosopher and as one of the leaders of European socialism. As early as 1844 he had written a series of articles on the phenomenon of man's alienation—from the material world, from his fellow men, and from himself. Only one of these articles was published at the time, but the discovery of the manuscripts nearly a century later has done much to correct the view of Marx as a simple materialist and to focus attention on the more reflective and humanist aspects of his philosophy. In 1846 Marx wrote his other two major philosophical statements: the brief *Theses on Feuerbach*, which Engels published after his death, and *The German Ideology*, in which Marx's great philosophical intelligence was directed against the neo-Hegelian idealist philosophers of his day. A

brief passage from the latter work embodies some of the qualities of sharpness and wit that made the young Marx so formidable a controversialist:

A certain person once took it into his head that people drown in water only because they are obsessed by the *notion* of weight. If only, he thought, they could rid themselves of this idea, by calling it, for instance, superstitious or religious, they would thereby be saved from all danger of drowning. All his life he fought against the illusion of weight, concerning whose deleterious consequences statistics continually provided him with fresh evidence. This figure is the prototype of the German revolutionary philosophers of our day.

The full range of Marx's considerable polemical skills was revealed the following year, when in an attack of unparalleled ferocity he demolished Pierre Joseph Proudhon's *The Philosophy of Poverty* in a lengthy treatise called *The Poverty of Philosophy*. Proudhon was the most highly regarded socialist theoretician of the day, and in challenging every part of his doctrine—his philosophical beliefs, his economic theories, his political prescriptions—Marx was for the first time overtly asserting his own claim to leadership of the European socialist movement.

The fact that so many of Marx's early works took the form of outspoken attacks on his contemporaries should not obscure the much more important fact that in these very works Marx was rapidly defining and developing his own philosophical, historical, and political beliefs. More perhaps than any other great thinker, Marx worked out his own ideas through a kind of dialectical process involving first the assimilation and then the transcending of the ideas of his predecessors and his contemporaries. This helps to account both for the somewhat derivative aspect of so much of Marxism and for the vehemence of Marx's attacks on other thinkers, and particularly on those thinkers whose positions lay closest to his own. By 1847 Marx had laid the foundations of dialectical



tical materialism, incorporating elements of the philosophies of Hegel and Feuerbach and of the theories of Proudhon and the utopian socialists of the early nineteenth century. The power and persuasiveness of what we may now begin to call Marxism were soon made apparent in the *Communist Manifesto*. This is one of the very few true masterpieces of popular political literature and all the more astonishing when one recalls that it was written as an occasional work by two young men still in their twenties. As Sir Isaiah Berlin has said,

No other modern political movement or cause can claim to have produced anything comparable with it in eloquence or power. It is a document of prodigious dramatic force; in form it is an edifice of bold and arresting historical generalizations, mounting to a denunciation of the existing order in the name of the avenging forces of the future, much of it written in prose which has the lyrical quality of a great revolutionary hymn, whose effect, overwhelming even now, was probably greater at the time. . . . As an instrument of destructive propaganda it has no equal anywhere; its effect upon succeeding generations is unparalleled outside religious history; had its author written nothing else, it would have ensured his lasting fame.

In the *Manifesto*, Marx and Engels had depicted with the broadest strokes the whole sweep of human history from the primitive communism of the earliest societies to the advanced industrial communism that lay in the future. For the remainder of Marx's life his interest and attention were to be focused upon one brief moment in this immense historical span: the era of capitalism and of its predicted downfall. Much more than Engels, who wrote at length about the dawn of human history and about its end in the classless society, Marx avoided what would necessarily have been speculative discussions about the remote past and future and concentrated on the analysis of the society in which he lived. Nor is the reason for this choice at all obscure. Although in

some abstract sense all historical eras may be said to hold equal interest for the social scientist seeking to formulate laws of historical development, Marx's activist and reformist inclinations constantly led him back to the present, to the age in which one can act and can influence the course of history rather than simply observe it. As he had written in the *Theses on Feuerbach*, "The philosophers of the past merely interpreted the world in various ways. The point, however, is to change it."

Marx's determination to change the world found expression in a variety of ways—in his editorship of radical publications such as the *Rheinische Zeitung*, the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, in which he undertook to educate the people in preparation for the coming revolution; in his leadership of socialist movements such as the League of the Just and the Communist League, through which he hoped to organize the workers and make of them a truly revolutionary class; and, above all else, in his continuing and heroic efforts to *understand* capitalist society and the laws of its development. A number of things conspired to turn Marx's attention in the 1850s to the last of these. In the first place, the failure of the revolutions of 1848 convinced him that social and economic conditions were not yet ripe for the successful rising of the working class of any country. This in itself suggested a retreat from active agitation and organization to further study and theoretical preparation. Furthermore, it was necessary to explain what had gone wrong in 1848 and to attempt to predict the moment at which action would be appropriate. In particular, Marx believed, such an explanation and such a prediction required a thorough understanding of the workings of the capitalist economic system; and where better arrive at such an understanding than in England, the home of economic liberalism, the spawning place of industrialism, the capitalist nation *par excellence*? Fate, in the guise of the Prussian and French police, had seen to it that Marx would

have an opportunity to immerse himself in the economic data of capitalism. Exiled in a land whose language he scarcely knew, separated from his associates and from the organizations through which he had worked, Marx grasped the opportunity and made the most of it.

## II

Marx arrived in London penniless and alone; he was soon joined by his wife, their three children, and their lifelong (though generally unpaid) servant, Helene Demuth. For a few months the family lived in a furnished apartment in the pleasant suburb of Camberwell, but in the spring of 1850 they were evicted for inability to pay the rent. From this time on the story of the Marxes' life is an almost unbroken chronicle of poverty, misery, and squalor. A Prussian police spy has left a description of the slum in Dean Street, Soho, in which they lived for six years:

He lives in one of the worst and cheapest neighborhoods in London. He occupies two rooms. The room looking out on the street is the parlor, the bedroom is at the back. There is not one clean or decent piece of furniture in either room, everything is broken, tattered, and torn, with thick dust over everything and the greatest untidiness everywhere. In the middle of the parlor there is a large old-fashioned table covered with oil-cloth. On it manuscripts, books and newspapers lie beside the children's toys, bits and pieces from his wife's sewing basket, cups with broken rims, dirty spoons, knives and forks, lamps, an inkwell, tumblers, some Dutch clay pipes, tobacco ash—all piled up on the same table.

On entering the room smoke and tobacco fumes make your eyes water to such an extent that at first you seem to be groping about in a cavern, until you get used to it and manage to pick out certain objects in the haze. Everything is dirty and covered with dust, and sitting down is quite a dangerous business. Here is a chair with only three legs, there another which happens to

be whole, on which the children are playing at cooking. That is the one that is offered to the visitor, but the children's cooking is not removed, and if you sit down you risk a pair of trousers. But all these things do not in the least embarrass Marx or his wife. You are received in the most friendly way and cordially offered pipes, tobacco and whatever else there may happen to be. Presently a clever and interesting conversation arises which makes amends for all the domestic deficiencies and makes the discomfort bearable. You actually get used to the company and find it interesting and original.

On occasion the family quite literally starved until someone—usually the faithful Engels—could give them enough money to buy food; often they lived for days on bread and potatoes, and then only by pawning most of their meager possessions. Once when Marx pawned a piece of his wife's family silver, which bore the same crest as that of the Duke of Argyll, to whom she was distantly related, he was thrown into jail as a suspicious character and remained there until his more respectable friends arranged for his release two days later. During these miserable years three children were born to the Marxes and all died in infancy. Frau Marx described to a friend the death of the second:

For three days the poor child wrestled with death. She suffered so. . . . Her little dead body lay in the small back room; we all of us went into the front room, and when night came we made beds on the floor, the three living children lying by us. And we wept for the little angel resting near us, cold and dead. The death of the dear child came in the time of our bitterest poverty. Our German friends could not help us; Engels, after vainly trying to get literary work in London, had been obliged to go, under very disadvantageous conditions, into his father's firm, as a clerk, in Manchester; Ernest Jones, who often came to see us at this time, and had promised to help, could do nothing. . . . In the anguish of my heart I went to a French refugee who lived near, and who had sometimes visited us. I told him our sore need. At once with the friendliest kindness he

gave me two pounds. With that we paid for the little coffin in which the poor child now sleeps peacefully.

For days at a time the whole family would huddle together in its cold, unlighted rooms, unable to go out because its clothing had all been pawned, unable to call a doctor or pay for medicine when, as was so often the case, the children or their parents were ill—waiting for the charity upon which their very survival depended. And this grinding poverty continued not for weeks or months, but year after year after year.

What is truly incredible is the fact that under these circumstances Marx was able to carry on his work. Nor was this because he was insensible to pain or indifferent to the sufferings of his family. All contemporary accounts agree that Marx was the most devoted and affectionate of husbands and fathers; the only bright spots in these sordid years are occasional descriptions of happy family picnics in Hampstead or of Papa Marx playing games with his children. When six-year-old Edgar died, Marx wrote to Engels:

The house seems deserted and empty since the death of the child who was its living soul. It is impossible to describe how much we constantly miss him. I have suffered every kind of misfortune, but I have only just learnt what real unhappiness is. . . . Bacon says that really important people have so many contacts with nature and the world, have so much to interest them, that they easily get over any loss. I am not one of those important people. My child's death has affected me so greatly that I feel the loss as bitterly as on the first day.

But if Marx was not sufficiently "important" (in Bacon's sense) to take his sufferings lightly, his work was so important to him that he was determined to get on with it at all costs. It is possible that his misery simply inflamed his passionate desire to expose the real workings of the capitalist system and to reveal the squalor which it had wrought in the

mid-nineteenth century. And it is even possible that Marx was being serious rather than ironic when he wrote that "There is only one antidote to mental suffering, and that is physical pain." Surely he had known enough of both to be able to judge.

What was the work that so engaged Marx's attention during these unhappy years? When he first arrived in London he had attempted, with substantial success, to carry on his old way of life. He immediately established contact with German émigré circles and once again became active in the leadership of the Communist League. He lectured on politics and economics to the German Workers' Educational Union in London. He revived the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, now as a review rather than a newspaper, and wrote for it a remarkable series of articles on recent events in France. A first group of these articles on the French Revolution of 1848 was later collected and published as *The Class Struggles in France*; a collection dealing with the *coup d'état* of December 1851 and called *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* was published in New York at the expense of an immigrant German tailor who contributed his life's savings—forty dollars—to pay for the printing. These pieces reveal Marx at the height of his powers as a political analyst and propagandist. Within thirteen months, however, the pattern of life that he had so carefully rebuilt in exile was once again shattered. By September 1850 it had become clear that the majority of the members of the Communist League disapproved of Marx's leadership; Marx, who recognized this fact, and who was in control of the League's Executive Committee, arranged to have the headquarters of the League transferred from London to Cologne. After a notorious trial there, following an attempt on the life of the Prussian king, seven members of the League were imprisoned and the League itself was soon dissolved. At about the same time the *Revue der Neuen Rheinische Zeitung* ceased publication after six issues. Although Marx had used up what little remained of

his father's estate in a desperate attempt to keep the review alive, the German-speaking audience for such a periodical was at best small in England, and Marx's scathing comments on his fellow exiles rapidly succeeded in alienating even them.

Characteristically, Marx refused to be discouraged by the dissolution of the League, the collapse of the *Revue*, and his own increasing isolation. In February of 1851 he wrote to Engels: "[Our isolation] corresponds to our position and our principles. The system of reciprocal concessions, of half-measures tolerated for appearances, the obligation to share in public with all these asses in the general absurdity of the party—we are done with all that now." "From now on," Engels replied, "we are responsible for ourselves alone; and when the moment arrives when these gentlemen find they need us, we shall be in a position to dictate our own terms." With Marx starving in a London slum and Engels working as a poorly paid clerk in the Manchester office of his father's textile firm of Ermen & Engels, there seemed to be singularly little ground for such confidence. But in fact it proved correct, for at just this inauspicious point in his career Marx embarked upon the enterprise that more than any other is responsible for his deserved reputation as the greatest of socialist theoreticians: the masterly analysis of the economics of capitalism that was to bear fruit in his *Critique of Political Economy* (1859) and *Capital* (1867 and after). In June of 1851 he gained admission to the Reading Room of the British Museum—"the ideal strategic vantage point for the student of bourgeois society," he called it—and there he sat day after day from nine in the morning until seven at night meticulously developing the theory and painstakingly amassing the empirical evidence upon which his masterpiece was built. During these years of preparation he read, quite literally, *everything* that was relevant to his subject, from the writings of the classical economists to the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Factories, from the most abstruse treatises on in-

dustrial techniques to the most trivial of popular journalism. Never has a scholar more thoroughly mastered the literature of his field.

### III

Marx had been at work in the British Museum for about two months when he received, early in August of 1851, an invitation to write a series of articles on recent political events in Germany. The invitation came in a letter from Charles A. Dana, the managing editor of *The New York Daily Tribune*, who had been introduced to Marx in Cologne by Ferdinand Freiligrath, a revolutionary poet and contributor to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. This was the beginning of an association that was to last for ten years and was to provide Marx not only an audience for his writings but also the only regular source of income he ever enjoyed.

*The New York Daily Tribune* under Horace Greeley and Charles Dana was an extraordinary journalistic phenomenon. It was at once the champion of utopian socialist ideas and the most respected and influential newspaper in the United States. In particular, it espoused the Fourierist ideas which had inspired the Brook Farm community in Massachusetts and the North American Phalanx in Red Bank, New Jersey, and it allowed a Fourierist association to publish first daily and then triweekly articles on its front page. Much more importantly, however, the *Tribune* set a standard of professional journalism that was not approached by any of its rivals. By the early 1850s it employed fourteen local reporters, twenty American correspondents, and eighteen foreign correspondents. Its news-gathering facilities were matched by its editorial taste, its moral rectitude, and its general level of intellectual appeal, all of which joined to win for it a national circulation of more than 250,000. The paper's general editorial policy, apart from its ventures into Fourierism, was progressive and tinged with anticapitalist sentiments, reflecting



chiefly the biases of Horace Greeley, its founder and publisher. It supported the agrarian agitation for free distribution of government lands to settlers as a bulwark against capitalist tyranny; it attacked the grant of land to railroads as monopolistic; it opposed capital punishment; it urged that abolitionists should enjoy freedom of speech and of the mails; it advocated government restraints on the liquor trade; and it supported retail cooperatives and labor unions. Paradoxically, Greeley and the *Tribune* favored high protective tariffs, but argued that they were desirable only in the short run, as a temporary means to the end of free trade. In the 1850s the *Tribune* became the leading advocate of the newly formed Free Soil Party, devoted to the prohibition of slavery in the free states and the territories of the United States. All in all it was, as Allan Nevins has written, "a great popular teacher, champion, and moral leader, and a vehicle for the ideas and experiments of constructive democracy."

Karl Marx's estimate was not quite so favorable. Discussing a book called *Slavery at Home and Abroad*, by an American economist named Carey, he wrote (in a letter to Engels in 1853):

The *Tribune* is of course trumpeting Carey's book with all its might. Both indeed have this in common, that under the guise of Sismondian philanthropic socialistic anti-industrialism they represent the Protectionists, i.e., the industrial bourgeoisie of America. This also explains the secret why the *Tribune* in spite of all its "isms" and socialistic humbug can be the "leading journal" in the United States.

By the time he wrote these words about the *Tribune*, however, Marx had already become one of its regular foreign correspondents.

Dana's original invitation to write a series of articles arrived, as we have seen, at a moment in Marx's life when he had the strongest reasons for accepting it: he was destitute

and he was without a journal in which to publish his views. Indeed, there were only two practical considerations that might have stood in Marx's way, or at least made him hesitate: he was already deeply involved in his economic researches and, perhaps more to the point, he was not able to write easily or well in English. In a wonderfully typical gesture, Marx overcame both obstacles at once by having Engels write the articles for him. On August 8, 1851, he asked Engels for an article in English "on the German situation"; on August 14 he proposed "a series of articles on Germany since 1848"; on August 21 he received the first article and sent it on to Dana, who published it in the *Tribune* under Marx's name on October 25. In all, eighteen articles on Germany appeared, and they were evidently a great success. In December 1851, Dana reported to Marx on the publication of the first articles and proposed an honorarium of one pound for each article published. These terms were accepted by Marx and on March 12, 1852, Dana wrote, "It may perhaps give you pleasure to know that [your articles] are read with satisfaction by a considerable number of persons, and are widely reproduced." Indeed, the articles were so well received that the next month (April 20) Dana asked Marx to write regularly for the *Tribune* on English affairs as well. This marked the beginning of Marx's career as a regular correspondent. Over the next ten years the *Tribune* published a total of 487 of his articles.

We might pause here to consider briefly the question of the actual authorship of the articles that appeared in the *Tribune* under Marx's name, or that have otherwise been attributed to him. The *Tribune* itself offers few clues. As we have seen in the case of the first eighteen articles on Germany, it began by using Marx's name on whatever articles it received from him, regardless of whether he had written them; indeed, it is reasonable to assume that Dana was quite unaware of Engels' participation. In April of 1853, however, the *Tribune* began a practice that was to continue through-

out its association with Marx. It took the first paragraphs of an article on Turkey—which in fact had been written by Engels—and printed them as its own editorial; over the next eight years no fewer than 165 such editorials, written by Marx and Engels, but not attributed to them, were printed by the *Tribune*. More often than not, the remaining paragraphs of the article that Marx had submitted would be published on the same day and attributed either to him by name or to “Our Correspondent.” Marx was not happy about this practice, and between June and September of 1854 he and Dana exchanged several letters about it. Marx repeatedly insisted that either all or none of the articles he sent should be signed with his name, and he finally had his way. From April of 1855 on, all Marx’s—and Engels’—articles were printed anonymously. As a result of all this, one finds in the *Tribune* both articles attributed to Marx that were not written by him and articles that were written by him but are not attributed to him.

Fortunately, the picture is not nearly so obscure as this might suggest. Through the use of all available internal and external evidence, scholars have been able to determine with great precision which articles Marx wrote, which Engels wrote, and which were collaborative efforts. We now know that of the total of 487 articles published by the *Tribune*, 350 were written by Marx alone, 125 were written by Engels alone, and 12 were written by Marx and Engels together. We also know that, with the exception of the first articles on Germany—which, ironically, were published by Marx’s daughter as examples of her father’s best journalism—Engels’ contribution was confined almost solely to the writing of pieces on military affairs, a subject in which he was deeply interested throughout his life. Indeed, when treating of wars and battles Engels was apt to become altogether too professional. “You must your *war-articles colour a little more*,” Marx once protested in a letter, “since you’re writing for a *general newspaper*, not for a scientific military journal. Something more

descriptive and individual is easy to get out of the *Times* Correspondent and throw in. I can't stick it in myself, because there would be a discrepancy of style." As this suggests, even the articles written by Engels alone were carefully reviewed, and sometimes revised, by Marx before they were submitted to the *Tribune*. And of course Marx was willing to take responsibility for all of the articles, and to have them appear under his name. Curiously, Dana seems to have unknowingly preferred Engels' articles, at least when he was choosing material for his editorials. Although, as we have seen, Engels wrote just slightly more than a quarter of all the articles published, his articles account for well over half of the editorials; in fact more than two out of three of Engels' articles were borrowed by Dana, while Marx was so honored only one time out of ten.

The first of Marx's own articles, called "The Elections in England: Tories and Whigs," was published in the *Tribune* on August 21, 1852. Engels' series on Germany had been brought to a close after the receipt of a tactful letter from Dana:

I do not know how long you intend to make the series, and under ordinary circumstances I should desire to have it prolonged as much as possible. But we have a presidential election at hand, which will occupy our columns to a great extent. . . . Let me suggest to you if possible to condense your survey into say half a dozen more articles. Do not, however, close it without an exposition of the forces now remaining at work there and active in the preparation of the future.

Marx now undertook to comply with Dana's request for articles on English affairs, writing in German and sending his manuscripts to Engels to be translated. In January 1853 he was informed by Dana that his fee was being doubled; in the future he would receive two pounds for each article printed by the *Tribune*. In the same month, Marx wrote his first article in English, on capital punishment and other topics. As

time passed, and as tensions increased in Central and Eastern Europe, Marx and Engels ranged further afield for their material; by the summer of 1853 they were writing on every aspect of world politics. And their efforts continued to meet with Dana's approval; in July of 1853 he wrote to inform Marx that his articles were "most highly esteemed" by the proprietors of the *Tribune* and by its readers as well.

During 1853 the *Tribune* printed 80 articles, of which 10 were written by Engels; in 1854 the number rose to 83, of which 22 were written by Engels. At this point, however, the number sharply declined—40 articles were printed in 1855 (21 by Engels), and only 24 in 1856 (2 by Engels). Apparently this was the result not of a falling off in the number of articles submitted by Marx, but rather of an editorial decision on Dana's part. During the early months of 1857 there was a heated exchange of letters between the author and his editor. Marx protested that a number of his manuscripts had not been published and that sometimes several weeks had passed without any articles being printed. He finally threatened to join another American newspaper unless the *Tribune* undertook to do better in the future. The controversy was settled when the *Tribune* guaranteed to pay Marx for one article each week, whether one was published or not, and to pay him his usual rate for any additional articles that it might publish. This seems to have had the effect of stabilizing the number of published articles at about one a week. In 1857 precisely 52 articles were published; in 1858 the number rose to 64; in 1859 it was 62; and in 1860 it was 40. In any case, the terms on which Marx was willing to settle strongly suggest that what had bothered him was not so much the editorial judgment that led to the rejection of his articles as the loss of revenue that it involved. Nor is this particularly surprising in view of Marx's low opinion of the *Tribune's* editorial policies.

Perhaps because their recent controversy had made him aware of Marx's desperate financial situation, or perhaps

simply because he had come to admire Marx's writing, Dana invited Marx in April 1857 to contribute a number of articles to the *New American Cyclopaedia*, one of the most wildly successful publishing ventures of its kind. Ironically, he asked in particular for articles on military history. Marx accepted the invitation, farming out as many articles as possible to Engels, but doing most of the research himself because he had access to the British Museum. For the next year a haunting alphabetical motif was to run through Marx's work: in June he wrote a piece on "Aesthetics"; in mid-September he sent Dana articles on "Barclay de Tolly," "Berthier," "Blum," and "Bourrienne"; a few weeks later he forwarded an article on "Bernadotte"; in January he was busy gathering materials for Engels on "Catapult," "Castrum," "Camp," and "Percussion Cap"; in February and March he produced articles on "Buda," "Beresford" (with Engels), and "Bülow." For some unexplained reason, there is no record of any further contributions. Perhaps Marx was unwilling to spend any further time on such trivia in the months when he was putting the finishing touches on his *Critique of Political Economy*. We do know that his need for money was as great as ever, and that he continued to send articles to the *Tribune* throughout this period.

Marx's career as a correspondent for the *Tribune* ended as unexpectedly as it had begun. By the beginning of 1861 Horace Greeley had become disturbed by Marx's views and had urged Dana to dismiss him. Dana refused, but he did inform Marx in January that the publication of his articles would have to be suspended for six weeks. In fact, no articles were published for eight months, between February 12 and October 11, 1861. Then on March 28, 1862, Dana wrote to tell Marx that coverage of the Civil War had come to fill all the columns of the *Tribune* and that, therefore, no space was available for printing his articles. An article entitled "The Mexican Imbrolio," which appeared on March 10, was the last to be published. In 1862 Dana was dismissed from the

*Tribune* and went to work for the War Department; by the time the Civil War was over, Greeley himself had lost control of the newspaper and had begun to devote all his energies to politics. At the same time Marx was becoming increasingly involved in the affairs of the First International, which was founded in London in 1864, and was laboring heroically to complete the first volume of *Capital*. Thus the three chief participants in Marx's venture into American journalism had all turned their attention to other things.

#### IV

Marx's American journalism is remarkable for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that so much of it is so good. Surely the circumstances under which the articles were written seemed about as unpromising as any that can be imagined. Marx, as we have seen, begrudged any time that he had to devote to this enterprise, both because he had more important work to do and because he had no respect for the *Tribune* or its editors or its readers. "It is utterly disgusting," he once wrote, "to have to be grateful when a rag like that kindly consents to take one into its canoe. Grinding bones and making soup out of them like the paupers in the workhouse, that is how much the political work for such a paper amounts to." Furthermore, the circumstances of Marx's life were grotesquely unsuited to his role as a foreign correspondent. Debilitating poverty and squalor were bad enough in themselves, but they also meant that he was utterly cut off from any contact with official circles or with the sort of influential people who might provide him with "inside" information and gossip for his columns. Occasionally he was so poor that he could not even afford to buy the newspapers from which he regularly learned what was going on in the world.

The mystery of how Marx was able to produce such distinguished work under such inauspicious circumstances can

perhaps partially be solved by suggesting that at least some of the apparent handicaps under which he labored were in fact advantages. Thus, for example, it may be argued that Marx's very real isolation from the obvious and conventional sources of news compelled him to look elsewhere for material. In so doing, he turned to such published—but seldom exploited—sources as commercial statistics, official reports, treaties, and parliamentary debates. This gave to his articles a depth and a solidity that were not to be found in the writings of those who relied upon court gossip and political chit-chat. Similarly, the fact that while Marx was writing for the *Tribune* he was also regularly engaged in scholarly research, although obviously inconvenient for him, was unquestionably a source of strength rather than of weakness. It is unlikely that any professional, full-time journalist has ever brought to his work the incredible range of knowledge that Marx possessed. He seems, indeed, to have been constitutionally incapable of superficiality or of writing about any subject until he had mastered all the available information. His journalism was one of the immediate beneficiaries of this unceasing quest for knowledge, and although it tended to be a by-product of other activities that Marx viewed as more important, it was nonetheless enriched by them. Thus, for example, when Marx's "serious" work led him in September and October of 1853 to read widely in the history of Denmark, he also produced articles on Danish political affairs for the *Tribune*; he learned Spanish during April and May of 1854 in order to read Calderón and Cervantes, and that summer he sent the *Tribune* a series of distinguished articles on events in Spain. Writing in 1860 of his strange fascination with the works of the Russophobe David Urquhart, Marx described another instance of this same process:

Urquhart's writings on Russia had interested but not convinced me. In order to arrive at a definite opinion, I made a minute analysis of Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, and of the Diplo-



matic Blue Books from 1807 to 1850. The first fruits of these studies was a series of articles in the *New York Tribune*, in which I proved Palmerston's relations with the Russian Government.

In a sense Marx was, as he put it in his apt simile, "grinding bones and making soup out of them." But one result of this admirable economy of time and effort, of this understandable reluctance to have anything go to waste, was political journalism of extraordinary depth and richness.

Perhaps it is not too fanciful to suggest that even Marx's low opinion of the *Tribune's* editorial policies and of its readers had a positive side. One cannot help being struck by the fact that Marx's articles for the *Tribune* are unusually detached and objective in their appraisal of current events; dogmatic ideology and partisan political appeals are conspicuously absent from them. The reader who looks for the kind of tendentious twisting of facts to fit a rigid, predetermined "line" that is characteristic of so many of Marx's followers will be disappointed. Might this not be explained by the peculiar role that Marx was playing as a correspondent for what he himself called the "leading journal" of "the industrial bourgeoisie of America"? On some issues, such as opposition to the despotic governments of Europe, Marx's policies and those of the *Tribune* were in perfect agreement. On some other issues of a rather general kind, Marx delighted in subtly undermining the newspaper's position. "Your article on Switzerland," he wrote to Engels in 1853, "was of course a direct smack at the leader in the *Tribune* (against centralization, etc.), and *their* Carey. I have continued this hidden warfare in a first article on India, in which the destruction of native industry by England is described as *revolutionary*. This will be very shocking to them." But on the issues that really counted, Marx had no reason to suppose that he could convert either the *Tribune* or its readers to his point of view. Although he is said once to have thanked God

that he was not a Marxist, he was at least enough of one to believe that words would not make a socialist of a man whose interests were inextricably bound up with the capitalist system. The most that he could reasonably hope to accomplish through his *Tribune* articles, then, was to open its readers' eyes to what he believed to be the realities of the world they lived in. This is exactly what he proceeded to do.

Marx's American journalism owes its special character to what Engels described—perhaps immodestly, under the circumstances—as “that marvellous gift of apprehending clearly the character, the significance, and the necessary consequences of great historical events at a time when these events are actually in course of taking place, or are only just completed.” More impressive than the breadth of his knowledge, the trenchancy of his wit, the felicity of his style—all of which were considerable—is the fact that in treating of current events Marx was able so consistently to distinguish the real from the illusory, the important from the trivial, the permanently significant from the momentarily impressive phenomena of his time. Even when his topic was the domestic scandals of an English duchess, he was able to produce a small masterpiece of social criticism, a thundering denunciation not of the foibles of a foolish old woman, but of the *system* that gave her power over the lives and fortunes of her tenants. And when he turned to the central events of his time—to the diplomatic crises and the wars that shook the European order, to the class tensions and repressions that followed the revolutions of 1848, to the causes and effects of European imperialism in China and India—Marx penetrated beneath the surface to reveal much of the true nature and direction of the forces that were secretly at work.

This is not to suggest that his journalism was without flaws. He tended to find sinister forces and devious interests everywhere, even where they probably did not exist; his Russophobia and his attitude toward Lord Palmerston are classic examples. And he consistently overestimated the importance

of economics and underestimated the importance of politics as an autonomous activity. But each of these weaknesses is really no more than an exaggerated form of one of Marx's great strengths. In an age when men generally were all too ready to accept at face value politicians' own explanations of their acts and motives, it was no mean achievement to suggest—with evidence—that the truth is often much more complex and much less creditable to those in high places. In an age when the study of history and of world affairs tended to be almost exclusively concerned with the comings and goings of kings and prime ministers, of presidents and party leaders, it took a man of real genius to reveal the enormous influence of basic social and economic forces upon political events. If Marx's achievement seems less striking and original today than it must have in the mid-nineteenth century, to a great extent this is because the general approach to political history and analysis that he invented has been almost universally adopted in our time. If a preoccupation with the social and economic background of politics, and a determination to uncover the real motives that lie behind the words of politicians and governments, are the hallmarks of modern political journalism, Karl Marx may properly be said to be its father.

CHARLES BLITZER

## Editor's Preface

---

There is little that I can add to the Introduction kindly provided by Dr. Blitzer, except perhaps to make a few brief remarks concerning the details of preparing this book.

First, it is important to keep in mind the extent of the Marx-Engels journalism for *The New York Daily Tribune*. There are some 500 articles, written and published over a period of ten years, ranging in coverage literally across the globe, and not restricted merely to events of the day, but giving extensive historical, political, economic, and sociological background analysis. Obviously, no one volume can fully encompass this scope of material. Indeed, this is the first time that a general anthology has been drawn from it—a one-volume compilation intended to provide an impartial, overall view of this highly significant journalism.

Since Marx and Engels were reporting from Great Britain, their coverage of Britain and British India has special interest. And, as refugees from Germany, they brought an intimate first-hand knowledge to the analysis of German affairs. Thus, a selection of their articles about the important nations of Britain, India, and Germany would seem to be an indispensable part of any general anthology of their *Tribune* journalism. And because of the significance both then and now of Russia and China, and the impact that the thought of Marx and Engels has had on the historical development of each of these major powers, obviously they, too, must be prominently represented in such an anthology. Finally, the United

States must be included, not only because of its importance as a world power, but also because of the special way it was regarded by Marx and Engels. Many contemporary readers may be surprised to discover the intensity of the affection in which Marx and Engels held the United States; to them, American society was a unique and inspiring democratic achievement which deserved the support of workers and radical intellectuals throughout the world, regardless of nationality. Therefore, the composition of this book dictated itself—a collection of Marx-Engels articles about six highly significant nations: Britain, Germany, Russia, India, China, and the United States.

The historical significance of these articles is obvious. Also, they have a special literary interest because they are not translations, but, on the contrary, were written by Marx and Engels in English, and, moreover, were intended specifically for American readers.

Great care has been taken to present each article in its entirety, without cuts of any kind. The text has been altered only by the modernization of a small number of nineteenth-century conventions of spelling and punctuation, which it was felt would distract the reader for no good reason. When an article was published with a title, that exact title is given, of course. When an article appeared without title, which was frequently the case, I have included in parentheses the working titles originated by Eleanor Marx Aveling, Marx's daughter, to accompany her own historic nineteenth-century collections of these articles.

The authorship of each article is indicated at the end. This information is derived from sources specified in the Appendix.

HENRY M. CHRISTMAN

**The American Journalism of  
MARX & ENGELS**

---

## (Germany at the Outbreak of the Revolution of 1848)<sup>1</sup>

---

*Dated September 1851 / Published October 25, 1851*

The first act of the revolutionary drama on the continent of Europe has closed. The "powers that were" before the hurricane of 1848 are again the "powers that be," and the more or less popular rulers of a day, provisional governors, triumvirs, dictators, with their tail of representatives, civil commissioners, military commissioners, prefects, judges, generals, officers, and soldiers, are thrown upon foreign shores, and "transported beyond the seas" to England or America, there to form new governments *in partibus infidelium*, European committees, central committees, national committees, and to announce their advent with proclamations quite as solemn as those of any less imaginary potentates.

A more signal defeat than that undergone by the continen-

<sup>1</sup> See Editor's Preface for the explanation of the use of parentheses.

tal revolutionary party—or rather parties—upon all points of the line of battle, cannot be imagined. But what of that? Has not the struggle of the British middle classes for their social and political supremacy embraced forty-eight, that of the French middle classes forty, years of unexampled struggles? And was their triumph ever nearer than at the very moment when restored monarchy thought itself more firmly settled than ever? The times of that superstition which attributed revolutions to the ill-will of a few agitators have long passed away. Everyone knows nowadays that wherever there is a revolutionary convulsion there must be some social want in the background, which is prevented by outworn institutions from satisfying itself. The want may not yet be felt as strongly, as generally, as might ensure immediate success, but every attempt at forcible repression will only bring it forth stronger and stronger, until it bursts its fetters. If, then, we have been beaten, we have nothing else to do but to begin again from the beginning. And, fortunately, the probably very short interval of rest which is allowed us between the close of the first and the beginning of the second act of the movement gives us time for a very necessary piece of work: the study of the causes that necessitated both the late outbreak and its defeat—causes that are not to be sought for in the accidental efforts, talents, faults, errors, or treacheries of some of the leaders, but in the general social state and conditions of existence of each of the convulsed nations. That the sudden movements of February and March 1848 were not the work of single individuals, but spontaneous, irresistible manifestations of national wants and necessities, more or less clearly understood, but very distinctly felt by numerous classes in every country, is a fact recognized everywhere, but when you inquire into the causes of the counterrevolutionary successes, there you are met on every hand with the ready reply that it was Mr. This or Citizen That who “betrayed” the people. Which reply may be very true or not, according to circumstances, but under no circumstances does it explain



anything—not even show how it came to pass that the “people” allowed themselves to be thus betrayed. And what a poor chance stands a political party whose entire stock in trade consists in a knowledge of the solitary fact that Citizen So-and-So is not to be trusted.

The inquiry into, and the exposition of, the causes, both of the revolutionary convulsion and its suppression, are, besides, of paramount importance in a historical point of view. All these petty personal quarrels and recriminations—all these contradictory assertions that it was Marrast, or Ledru-Rollin, or Louis Blanc, or any other member of the Provisional Government, or the whole of them, that steered the revolution amidst the rocks upon which it foundered—of what interest can they be, what light can they afford, to the American or Englishman who observed all these various movements from a distance too great to allow of his distinguishing any of the details of operations? No man in his senses will ever believe that eleven men, mostly of very indifferent capacity either for good or evil, were able in three months to ruin a nation of thirty-six millions, unless those thirty-six millions saw as little of their way before them as the eleven did. But how it came to pass that these thirty-six millions were at once called upon to decide for themselves which way to go, although partly groping in dim twilight, and how then they got lost and their old leaders were for a moment allowed to return to their leadership, that is just the question.

If, then, we try to lay before the readers of *The Tribune* the causes which, while they necessitated the German Revolution of 1848, led quite as inevitably to its momentary repression in 1849 and 1850, we shall not be expected to give a complete history of events as they passed in that country. Later events, and the judgment of coming generations, will decide what portion of that confused mass of seemingly accidental, incoherent, and incongruous facts is to form a part of the world's history. The time for such a task has not yet ar-

rived; we must confine ourselves to the limits of the possible, and be satisfied, if we can find rational causes based upon undeniable facts, to explain the chief events, the principal vicissitudes, of that movement, and to give us a clue as to the direction which the next, and perhaps not very distant, outbreak will impart to the German people.

And firstly, what was the state of Germany at the outbreak of the revolution?

The composition of the different classes of the people which form the groundwork of every political organization was, in Germany, more complicated than in any other country. While in England and France feudalism was entirely destroyed, or at least reduced, as in the former country, to a few insignificant forms, by a powerful and wealthy middle class, concentrated in large towns, and particularly in the capital, the feudal nobility in Germany had retained a great portion of their ancient privileges. The feudal system of tenure was prevalent almost everywhere. The lords of the land had even retained the jurisdiction over their tenants. Deprived of their political privileges, of the right to control the princes, they had preserved almost all their medieval supremacy over the peasantry of their demesnes, as well as their exemption from taxes. Feudalism was more flourishing in some localities than in others, but nowhere except on the left bank of the Rhine was it entirely destroyed. This feudal nobility, then extremely numerous and partly very wealthy, was considered, officially, the first "Order" in the country. It furnished the higher government officials, it almost exclusively officered the army.

The bourgeoisie of Germany was by far not as wealthy and concentrated as that of France or England. The ancient manufactures of Germany had been destroyed by the introduction of steam, and the rapidly extending supremacy of English manufactures; the more modern manufactures, started under the Napoleonic continental system, established in other parts of the country, did not compensate for the loss of

the old ones, nor suffice to create a manufacturing interest strong enough to force its wants upon the notice of governments jealous of every extension of nonnoble wealth and power. If France carried her silk manufactures victorious through fifty years of revolutions and wars, Germany, during the same time, all but lost her ancient linen trade. The manufacturing districts, besides, were few and far between; situated far inland, and using, mostly, foreign Dutch or Belgium, ports for their imports and exports, they had little or no interest in common with the large seaport towns on the North Sea and the Baltic; they were, above all, unable to create large manufacturing and trading centers, such as Paris and Lyons, London and Manchester. The causes of this backwardness of German manufactures were manifold, but two will suffice to account for it: the unfavorable geographical situation of the country, at a distance from the Atlantic, which had become the great highway for the world's trade, and the continuous wars in which Germany was involved, and which were fought on her soil, from the sixteenth century to the present day. It was this want of numbers, and particularly of anything like concentrated numbers, which prevented the German middle classes from attaining that political supremacy which the English bourgeoisie has enjoyed ever since 1688, and which the French conquered in 1789. And yet, ever since 1815, the wealth, and with the wealth the political importance of the middle class in Germany, was continually growing. Governments were, although reluctantly, compelled to bow, at least to its more immediate material interests. It may even be truly said that from 1815 to 1830, and from 1832 to 1840, every particle of political influence which, having been allowed to the middle class in the constitutions of the smaller states, was again wrested from them during the above two periods of political reaction, that every such particle was compensated for by some more practical advantage allowed to them. Every political defeat of the middle class drew after it a victory on the field of commercial

legislation. And, certainly, the Prussian Protective Tariff of 1818, and the formation of the *Zollverein*, were worth a good deal more to the traders and manufacturers of Germany than the equivocal right of expressing in the chambers of some diminutive dukedom their want of confidence in ministers who laughed at their votes. Thus, with growing wealth and extending trade, the bourgeoisie soon arrived at a stage where it found the development of its most important interests checked by the political constitution of the country; by its random division among thirty-six princes with conflicting tendencies and caprices; by the feudal fetters upon agriculture and the trade connected with it; by the prying superintendence to which an ignorant and presumptuous bureaucracy subjected all its transactions. At the same time the extension and consolidation of the *Zollverein*, the general introduction of steam communication, the growing competition in the home trade, brought the commercial classes of the different states and provinces closer together, equalized their interests, centralized their strength. The natural consequence was the passing of the whole mass of them into the camp of the liberal opposition, and the gaining of the first serious struggle of the German middle class for political power. This change may be dated from 1840, from the moment when the bourgeoisie of Prussia assumed the lead of the middle class movement of Germany. We shall hereafter revert to this liberal opposition movement of 1840-47.

The great mass of the nation, which neither belonged to the nobility nor to the bourgeoisie, consisted in the towns of the small trading and shopkeeping class and the working people, and in the country of the peasantry.

The small trading and shopkeeping class is exceedingly numerous in Germany, in consequence of the stunted development which the large capitalists and manufacturers as a class have had in that country. In the larger towns it forms almost the majority of the inhabitants; in the smaller ones it entirely predominates, from the absence of wealthier compet-

itors or influence. This class, a most important one in every modern body politic, and in all modern revolutions, is still more important in Germany, where, during the recent struggles, it generally played the decisive part. Its intermediate position between the class of larger capitalists, traders, and manufacturers, the bourgeoisie properly so-called, and the proletarian or industrial class, determines its character. Aspiring to the position of the first, the least adverse turn of fortune hurls the individuals of this class down into the ranks of the second. In monarchical and feudal countries the custom of the court and aristocracy becomes necessary to its existence; the loss of this custom might ruin a great part of it. In the smaller towns a military garrison, a county government, a court of law with its followers, form very often the base of its prosperity; withdraw these, and down go the shopkeepers, the tailors, the shoemakers, the joiners. Thus eternally tossed about between the hope of entering the ranks of the wealthier class and the fear of being reduced to the state of proletarians or even paupers; between the hope of promoting their interests by conquering a share in the direction of public affairs, and the dread of rousing, by ill-timed opposition, the ire of a government which disposes of their very existence, because it has the power of removing their best customers; possessed of small means, the insecurity of the possession of which is in the inverse ratio of the amount—this class is extremely vacillating in its views. Humble and crouchingly submissive under a powerful feudal or monarchical government, it turns to the side of liberalism when the middle class is in the ascendant; it becomes seized with violent democratic fits as soon as the middle class has secured its own supremacy, but falls back into the abject despondency of fear as soon as the class below itself, the proletarians, attempts an independent movement. We shall by and by see this class, in Germany, pass alternately from one of these stages to the other.

The working class in Germany is, in its social and political

development, as far behind that of England and France as the German bourgeoisie is behind the bourgeoisie of those countries. Like master, like man. The evolution of the conditions of existence for a numerous, strong, concentrated, and intelligent proletarian class goes hand in hand with the development of the conditions of existence for a numerous, wealthy, concentrated, and powerful middle class. The working class movement itself never is independent, never is of an exclusively proletarian character until all the different factions of the middle class, and particularly its most progressive faction, the large manufacturers, have conquered political power, and remodeled the state according to their wants. It is then that the inevitable conflict between the employer and the employed becomes imminent, and cannot be adjourned any longer; that the working class can no longer be put off with delusive hopes and promises never to be realized; that the great problem of the nineteenth century, the abolition of the proletariat, is at last brought forward fairly and in its proper light. Now, in Germany the mass of the working class were employed, not by those modern manufacturing lords of which Great Britain furnishes such splendid specimens, but by small tradesmen, whose entire manufacturing system is a mere relic of the Middle Ages. And as there is an enormous difference between the great cotton lord and the petty cobbler or master tailor, so there is a corresponding distance from the wide-awake factory operative of modern manufacturing Babylons to the bashful journeyman tailor or cabinet-maker of a small country town, who lives in circumstances and works after a plan very little different from those of the like sort of men some five hundred years ago. This general absence of modern conditions of life, of modern modes of industrial production, of course was accompanied by a pretty equally general absence of modern ideas, and it is, therefore, not to be wondered at if, at the outbreak of the revolution, a large part of the working classes should cry out for the immediate reestablishment of guilds and medieval

privileged trades' corporations. Yet from the manufacturing districts, where the modern system of production predominated, and in consequence of the facilities of intercommunication and mental development afforded by the migratory life of a large number of the working men, a strong nucleus formed itself, whose ideas about the emancipation of their class were far clearer and more in accordance with existing facts and historical necessities; but they were a mere minority. If the active movement of the middle classes may be dated from 1840, that of the working class commences its advent by the insurrections of the Silesian and Bohemian factory operatives in 1844, and we shall soon have occasion to pass in review the different stages through which this movement passed.

Lastly, there was the great class of the small farmers, the peasantry, which, with its appendix of farm laborers, constitutes a considerable majority of the entire nation. But this class again subdivided itself into different fractions. There were, firstly, the more wealthy farmers, what is called in Germany *Gross* and *Mittel-Bauern*, proprietors of more or less extensive farms, and each of them commanding the services of several agricultural laborers. This class, placed between the large untaxed feudal landowners, and the smaller peasantry and farm laborers, for obvious reasons found in an alliance with the antifeudal middle class of the towns its most natural political course. Then there were, secondly, the small freeholders, predominating in the Rhine country, where feudalism had succumbed before the mighty strokes of the great French Revolution. Similar independent small freeholders also existed here and there in other provinces, where they had succeeded in buying off the feudal charges formerly due upon their lands. This class, however, was a class of freeholders by name only, their property being generally mortgaged to such an extent, and under such onerous conditions, that not the peasant, but the usurer who had advanced the money, was the real landowner. Thirdly, the feudal tenants,

who could not be easily turned out of their holdings, but who had to pay a perpetual rent, or to perform in perpetuity a certain amount of labor in favor of the lord of the manor. Lastly, the agricultural laborers, whose condition, in many large farming concerns, was exactly that of the same class in England, and who in all cases lived and died poor, ill-fed, and the slaves of their employers. These three latter classes of the agricultural population, the small freeholders, the feudal tenants, and the agricultural laborers, never troubled their heads much about politics before the revolution, but it is evident that this event must have opened to them a new career, full of brilliant prospects. To every one of them the revolution offered advantages, and the movement once fairly engaged in, it was to be expected that, each in their turn, they would join it. But at the same time it is quite as evident, and equally borne out by the history of all modern countries, that the agricultural population, in consequence of its dispersion over a great space, and of the difficulty of bringing about an agreement among any considerable portion of it, never can attempt a successful independent movement; they require the initiatory impulse of the more concentrated, more enlightened, more easily moved people of the towns.

The preceding short sketch of the most important of the classes, which in their aggregate formed the German nation at the outbreak of the recent movements, will already be sufficient to explain a great part of the incoherence, incongruence, and apparent contradiction which prevailed in that movement. When interests so varied, so conflicting, so strangely crossing each other, are brought into violent collision; when these contending interests in every district, every province, are mixed in different proportions; when, above all, there is no great center in the country, no London, no Paris, the decisions of which, by their weight, may supersede the necessity of fighting out the same quarrel over and over again in every single locality; what else is to be expected but that the contest will dissolve itself into a mass of unconnected



struggles, in which an enormous quantity of blood, energy, and capital is spent, but which for all that remain without any decisive results?

The political dismemberment of Germany into three dozen of more or less important principalities is equally explained by this confusion and multiplicity of the elements which compose the nation, and which again vary in every locality. Where there are no common interests there can be no unity of purpose, much less of action. The German Confederation, it is true, was declared everlastingly indissoluble; yet the Confederation, and its organ, the Diet, never represented German unity. The very highest pitch to which centralization was ever carried in Germany was the establishment of the *Zollverein*; by this the states on the North Sea were also forced into a customs union of their own, Austria remaining wrapped up in her separate prohibitive tariff. Germany had the satisfaction to be, for all practical purposes, divided between three independent powers only, instead of between thirty-six. Of course the paramount supremacy of the Russian Czar, as established in 1814, underwent no change on this account.

Having drawn these preliminary conclusions from our premises, we shall see, in our next, how the aforesaid various classes of the German people were set into movement one after the other, and what character the movement assumed on the outbreak of the French Revolution of 1848.

(Engels)

## **(The Prussian State)**

---

*Dated September 1851 / Published October 28, 1851*

The political movement of the middle class or bourgeoisie in Germany may be dated from 1840. It had been preceded by symptoms showing that the moneyed and industrial class of that country was ripening into a state which would no longer allow it to continue apathetic and passive under the pressure of a half-feudal, half-bureaucratic monarchism. The smaller princes of Germany, partly to insure to themselves a greater independence against the supremacy of Austria and Prussia, or against the influence of the nobility of their own states, partly in order to consolidate into a whole the disconnected provinces united under their rule by the Congress of Vienna, one after the other granted constitutions of a more or less liberal character. They could do so without any danger to themselves; for if the Diet of the Confederation, this mere

puppet of Austria and Prussia, was to encroach upon their independence as sovereigns, they knew that in resisting its dictates they would be backed by public opinion and the chambers; and if, on the contrary, these chambers grew too strong, they could readily command the power of the Diet to break down all opposition. The Bavarian, Würtemberg, Baden, or Hanoverian constitutional institutions could not, under such circumstances, give rise to any serious struggle for political power, and, therefore, the great bulk of the German middle class kept very generally aloof from the petty squabbles raised in the legislatures of the small states, well knowing that without a fundamental change in the policy and constitution of the two great powers of Germany no secondary efforts and victories would be of any avail. But, at the same time, a race of liberal lawyers, professional oppositionists, sprung up in these small assemblies: the Rottecks, the Welckers, the Roemers, the Jordans, the Stüves, the Eisenmanns, those great "popular men" (*Volksmänner*) who, after a more or less noisy, but always unsuccessful, opposition of twenty years, were carried to the summit of power by the revolutionary springtide of 1848, and who, after having there shown their utter impotency and insignificance, were hurled down again in a moment. These first specimens upon German soil of the trader in politics and opposition, by their speeches and writings made familiar to the German ear the language of constitutionalism, and by their very existence foreboded the approach of a time when the middle class would seize upon and restore to their proper meaning political phrases which these talkative attorneys and professors were in the habit of using without knowing much about the sense originally attached to them.

German literature, too, labored under the influence of the political excitement into which all Europe had been thrown by the events of 1830. A crude constitutionalism, or a still cruder republicanism, were preached by almost all writers of the time. It became more and more the habit, particularly of

the inferior sorts of literati, to make up for the want of cleverness in their productions by political allusions which were sure to attract attention. Poetry, novels, reviews, the drama, every literary production teemed with what was called "tendency," that is, with more or less timid exhibitions of an antigovernmental spirit. In order to complete the confusion of ideas reigning after 1830 in Germany, with these elements of political opposition there were mixed up ill-digested university recollections of German philosophy, and misunderstood gleanings from French socialism, particularly Saint-Simonism; and the clique of writers who expatiated upon this heterogeneous conglomerate of ideas presumptuously called themselves "Young Germany," or "the Modern School." They have since repented their youthful sins, but not improved their style of writing.

Lastly, German philosophy, that most complicated, but at the same time most sure, thermometer of the development of the German mind, had declared for the middle class, when Hegel in his *Philosophy of Law* pronounced constitutional monarchy to be the final and most perfect form of government. In other words, he proclaimed the approaching advent of the middle classes of the country to political power. His school, after his death, did not stop here. While the more advanced section of his followers, on one hand, subjected every religious belief to the ordeal of a rigorous criticism, and shook to its foundation the ancient fabric of Christianity, they at the same time brought forward bolder political principles than hitherto it had been the fate of German ears to hear expounded, and attempted to restore to glory the memory of the heroes of the first French Revolution. The abstruse philosophical language in which these ideas were clothed, if it obscured the mind of both the writer and the reader, equally blinded the eyes of the censor, and thus it was that the "Young Hegelian" writers enjoyed a liberty of the press unknown in every other branch of literature.

Thus it was evident that public opinion was undergoing a

great change in Germany. By degrees, the vast majority of those classes whose education or position in life enabled them, under an absolute monarchy, to gain some political information, and to form anything like an independent political opinion, united into one mighty phalanx of opposition against the existing system. And in passing judgment upon the slowness of political development in Germany, no one ought to omit taking into account the difficulty of obtaining correct information upon any subject in a country where all sources of information were under the control of the government, where from the ragged school and the Sunday school to the newspaper and university nothing was said, taught, printed, or published but what had previously obtained its approbation. Look at Vienna, for instance. The people of Vienna, in industry and manufactures second to none perhaps in Germany; in spirit, courage, and revolutionary energy proving themselves far superior to all, were yet more ignorant as to their real interests, and committed more blunders, during the revolution than any others, and this was due in a very great measure to the almost absolute ignorance with regard to the very commonest political subjects in which Metternich's government had succeeded in keeping them.

It needs no further explanation why, under such a system, political information was an almost exclusive monopoly of such classes of society as could afford to pay for its being smuggled into the country, and more particularly of those whose interests were most seriously attacked by the existing state of things, namely, the manufacturing and commercial classes. They, therefore, were the first to unite in a mass against the continuance of a more or less disguised absolutism, and from their passing into the ranks of the opposition must be dated the beginning of the real revolutionary movement in Germany.

The oppositional pronunciamento of the German bourgeoisie may be dated from 1840, from the death of the late King of Prussia, the last surviving founder of the Holy Alli

ance of 1815. The new King was known to be no supporter of the predominantly bureaucratic and military monarchy of his father. What the French middle classes had expected from the advent of Louis XVI the German bourgeoisie hoped, in some measure, from Frederick William IV of Prussia. It was agreed upon all hands that the old system was exploded, worn-out, and must be given up; and what had been borne in silence under the old King now was loudly proclaimed to be intolerable.

But if Louis XVI, "Louis le Désiré," had been a plain, unpretending simpleton, half conscious of his own nullity, without any fixed opinions, ruled principally by the habits contracted during his education, "Frederick William le Désiré" was something quite different. While he certainly surpassed his French original in weakness of character, he was neither without pretensions nor without opinions. He had made himself acquainted, in an amateur sort of way, with the rudiments of most sciences, and thought himself, therefore, learned enough to consider final his judgment upon every subject. He made sure he was a first-rate orator, and there was certainly no commercial traveler in Berlin who could beat him either in prolixity of pretended wit, or in fluency of elocution. And, above all, he had his opinions. He hated and despised the bureaucratic element of the Prussian monarchy, but only because all his sympathies were with the feudal element. Himself one of the founders of, and chief contributors to, the *Berlin Political Weekly Paper*, the so-called Historical School (a school living upon the ideas of Bonald, De Maistre, and other writers of the first generation of French Legitimists), he aimed at a restoration, as complete as possible, of the predominant social position of the nobility. The King, first nobleman of his realm, surrounded in the first instance by a splendid court of mighty vassals, princes, dukes, and counts; in the second instance, by a numerous and wealthy lower nobility; ruling according to his discretion over his loyal burgesses and peasants, and thus

being himself the chief of a complete hierarchy of social ranks or castes, each of which was to enjoy its particular privileges and to be separated from the others by the almost insurmountable barrier of birth, or of a fixed, inalterable social position; the whole of these castes, or "estates of the realm," balancing each other at the same time so nicely in power and influence that a complete independence of action should remain to the King—such was the *beau idéal* which Frederick William IV undertook to realize, and which he is again trying to realize at the present moment.

It took some time before the Prussian bourgeoisie, not very well versed in theoretical questions, found out the real purport of their King's tendency. But what they very soon found out was the fact that he was bent upon things quite the reverse of what they wanted. Hardly did the new King find his "gift of the gab" unfettered by his father's death than he set about proclaiming his intentions in speeches without number; and every speech, every act of his, went far to estrange from him the sympathies of the middle class. He would not have cared much for that, if it had not been for some stern and startling realities which interrupted his poetic dreams. Alas, that romanticism is not very quick at accounts, and that feudalism, ever since Don Quixote, reckons without its host! Frederick William IV partook too much of that contempt of ready cash which ever has been the noblest inheritance of the sons of the Crusaders. He found at his accession a costly, although parsimoniously arranged, system of government, and a moderately filled state treasury. In two years every trace of a surplus was spent in court festivals, royal progresses, largesses, subventions to needy, seedy, and greedy noblemen, etc., and the regular taxes were no longer sufficient for the exigencies of either court or government. And thus His Majesty found himself very soon placed between a glaring deficit on one side, and a law of 1820 on the other, by which any new loan, or any increase of the then existing taxation, was made illegal without the assent of "the future Rep-

resentation of the People." This representation did not exist; the new King was less inclined than even his father to create it, and if he had been, he knew that public opinion had wonderfully changed since his accession.

Indeed, the middle classes, who had partly expected that the new King would at once grant a constitution, proclaim the liberty of the press, trial by jury, etc., etc.—in short, himself take the lead of that peaceful revolution which they wanted in order to obtain political supremacy—the middle classes had found out their error, and had turned ferociously against the King. In the Rhine provinces, and more or less generally all over Prussia, they were so exasperated that they, being short themselves of men able to represent them in the press, went to the length of an alliance with the extreme philosophical party, of which we have spoken above. The fruit of this alliance was the *Rhenish Gazette* of Cologne, a paper which was suppressed after fifteen months' existence, but from which may be dated the existence of the newspaper press in Germany. This was in 1842.

The poor King, whose commercial difficulties were the keenest satire upon his medieval propensities, very soon found out that he could not continue to reign without making some slight concession to the popular outcry for that "Representation of the People," which, as the last remnant of the long-forgotten promises of 1813 and 1815, had been embodied in the law of 1820. He found the least objectionable mode of satisfying this untoward law in calling together the standing committees of the provincial diets. The provincial diets had been instituted in 1823. They consisted, for every one of the eight provinces of the kingdom: (1) Of the higher nobility, the formerly sovereign families of the German Empire, the heads of which were members of the diet by birth-right. (2) Of the representatives of the knights or lower nobility. (3) Of representatives of towns. (4) Of deputies of the peasantry or small farming class. The whole was arranged in such a manner that in every province the two sec-



tions of the nobility always had a majority of the diet. Every one of these eight provincial diets elected a committee, and these eight committees were now called to Berlin in order to form a representative assembly for the purpose of voting the much-desired loan. It was stated that the treasury was full, and that the loan was required, not for current wants, but for the construction of a state railway. But the united committees gave the King a flat refusal, declaring themselves incompetent to act as the representatives of the people, and called upon His Majesty to fulfill the promise of a representative constitution which his father had given, when he wanted the aid of the people against Napoleon.

The sitting of the united committees proved that the spirit of opposition was no longer confined to the bourgeoisie. A part of the peasantry had joined them, and many nobles, being themselves large farmers on their own properties, and dealers in corn, wool, spirits, and flax, requiring the same guarantees against absolutism, bureaucracy, and feudal restoration, had equally pronounced against the government, and for a representative constitution. The King's plan had signally failed; he had got no money, and had increased the power of the opposition. The subsequent sitting of the provincial diets themselves was still more unfortunate for the King. All of them asked for reforms, for the fulfillment of the promises of 1813 and 1815, for a constitution and a free press; the resolutions to this effect of some of them were rather disrespectfully worded, and the ill-humored replies of the exasperated King made the evil still greater.

In the meantime, the financial difficulties of the government went on increasing. For a time, abatements made upon the moneys appropriated for the different public services, fraudulent transactions with the "Seehandlung," a commercial establishment speculating and trading for account and risk of the state, and long since acting as its money-broker, had sufficed to keep up appearances; increased issues of state paper money had furnished some resources; and the secret,

upon the whole, had been pretty well kept. But all these contrivances were soon exhausted. There was another plan tried: the establishment of a bank, the capital of which was to be furnished partly by the state and partly by private shareholders, the chief direction to belong to the state, in such a manner as to enable the government to draw upon the funds of this bank to a large amount, and thus to repeat the same fraudulent transactions that would no longer do with the "Seehandlung." But, as a matter of course, there were no capitalists to be found who would hand over their money upon such conditions; the statutes of the bank had to be altered, and the property of the shareholders guaranteed from the encroachments of the treasury, before any shares were subscribed for. Thus, this plan having failed, there remained nothing but to try a loan, if capitalists could be found who would lend their cash without requiring the permission and guarantee of that mysterious "future Representation of the People." Rothschild was applied to, and he declared that if the loan was to be guaranteed by this "Representation of the People," he would undertake the thing at a moment's notice—if not, he could not have anything to do with the transaction.

Thus every hope of obtaining money had vanished, and there was no possibility of escaping the fatal "Representation of the People." Rothschild's refusal was known in autumn 1846, and in February of the next year the King called together all the eight provincial diets to Berlin, forming them into one "United Diet." This Diet was to do the work required, in case of need, by the law of 1820; it was to vote loans and increased taxes, but beyond that it was to have no rights. Its voice upon general legislation was to be merely consultative; it was to assemble, not at fixed periods, but whenever it pleased the King; it was to discuss nothing but what the government pleased to lay before it. Of course, the members were very little satisfied with the part they were expected to perform. They repeated the wishes they had

enounced when they met in the provincial assemblies; the relations between them and the government soon became acrimonious, and when the loan, which was again stated to be required for railway constructions, was demanded from them, they again refused to grant it.

This vote very soon brought their sitting to a close. The King, more and more exasperated, dismissed them with a *reprimand*, but still remained without money. And, indeed, he had every reason to be alarmed at his position, seeing that the Liberal League, headed by the middle classes, comprising a large part of the lower nobility, and all the manifold discontents that had been accumulated in the different sections of the lower orders—that this Liberal League was determined to have what it wanted. In vain the King had declared, in the opening speech, that he would never, never grant a constitution in the modern sense of the word; the Liberal League insisted upon such a modern, antifeudal, representative constitution, with all its sequels, liberty of the press, trial by jury, etc.; and before they got it, not a farthing of money would they grant. There was one thing evident: that things could not go on long in this manner, and that either one of the parties must give way, or that a rupture—a bloody struggle—must ensue. And the middle classes knew that they were on the eve of a revolution, and they prepared themselves for it. They sought to obtain by every possible means the support of the working class of the towns, and of the peasantry in the agricultural districts, and it is well known that there was, in the latter end of 1847, hardly a single prominent political character among the bourgeoisie who did not proclaim himself a “socialist,” in order to insure to himself the sympathy of the proletarian class. We shall see these “socialists” at work by and by.

This eagerness of the leading bourgeoisie to adopt at least the outward show of socialism was caused by a great change that had come over the working classes of Germany. There had been, ever since 1840, a fraction of German workmen,

who, traveling in France and Switzerland, had more or less imbibed the crude socialist or communist notions then current among the French workmen. The increasing attention paid to similar ideas in France ever since 1840 made socialism and communism fashionable in Germany also, and as far back as 1843 all newspapers teemed with discussions of social questions. A school of socialists very soon formed itself in Germany, distinguished more for the obscurity than for the novelty of its ideas; its principal efforts consisted in the translation of French Fourierist, Saint-Simonian, and other doctrines into the abstruse language of German philosophy. The German communist school, entirely different from this sect, was formed about the same time.

In 1844, there occurred the Silesian weavers' riots, followed by the insurrection of the calico printers of Prague. These riots, cruelly suppressed, riots of working men not against the government, but against their employers, created a deep sensation, and gave a new stimulus to socialist and communist propaganda amongst the working people. So did the bread riots during the year of famine, 1847. In short, in the same manner as constitutional opposition rallied around its banner the great bulk of the propertied classes (with the exception of the large feudal landholders), so the working classes of the larger towns looked for their emancipation to the socialist and communist doctrines, although, under the then existing press laws, they could be made to know only very little about them. They could not be expected to have any very definite ideas as to what they wanted; they only knew that the program of the constitutional bourgeoisie did not contain all they wanted, and that their wants were nowise contained in the constitutional circle of ideas.

There was then no separate republican party in Germany. People were either constitutional monarchists or more or less clearly defined socialists or communists.

With such elements, the slightest collision must have brought about a great revolution. While the higher nobility

and the older civil and military officers were the only safe supports of the existing system; while the lower nobility, the trading middle classes, the universities, the schoolmasters of every degree, and even part of the lower ranks of the bureaucracy and military officers, were all leagued against the government; while behind these there stood the dissatisfied masses of the peasantry and of the proletarians of the large towns, supporting, for the time being, the liberal opposition, but already muttering strange words about taking things into their own hands; while the bourgeoisie was ready to hurl down the government, and the proletarians were preparing to hurl down the bourgeoisie in its turn; this government went on obstinately in a course which must bring about a collision. Germany was, in the beginning of 1848, on the eve of a revolution, and this revolution was sure to come, even had the French Revolution of February not hastened it.

What the effects of this Parisian revolution were upon Germany we shall see in our next.

(Engels)

## **(The Other German States)**

---

*Dated September 1851 / Published November 6, 1851*

In our last we confined ourselves almost exclusively to that state which, during the years 1840 to 1848, was by far the most important in the German movement, namely, to Prussia. It is, however, time to pass a rapid glance over the other states of Germany during the same period.

As to the petty states, they had, ever since the revolutionary movements of 1830, completely passed under the dictatorship of the Diet, that is of Austria and Prussia. The several constitutions, established as much as a means of defense against the dictates of the larger states as to insure popularity to their princely authors, and unity to heterogeneous assemblies of provinces, formed by the Congress of Vienna, without any leading principle whatever—these constitutions, illusory as they were, had yet proved dangerous to the

authority of the petty princes themselves during the exciting times of 1830 and 1831. They were all but destroyed; whatever of them was allowed to remain was less than a shadow, and it required the loquacious self-complacency of a Welcker, a Rotteck, a Dahlmann, to imagine that any results could possibly flow from the humble opposition, mingled with degrading flattery, which they were allowed to show off in the impotent chambers of these petty states.

The more energetic portion of the middle class in these smaller states, very soon after 1840, abandoned all the hopes they had formerly based upon the development of parliamentary government in these dependencies of Austria and Prussia. No sooner had the Prussian bourgeoisie and the classes allied to it shown a serious resolution to struggle for parliamentary government in Prussia than they were allowed to take the lead of the constitutional movement over all non-Austrian Germany. It is a fact which now will not any longer be contested that the nucleus of those constitutionalists of central Germany, who afterwards seceded from the Frankfurt National Assembly, and who, from the place of their separate meetings, were called the Gotha party, long before 1848 contemplated a plan which, with little modification, they in 1849 proposed to the representatives of all Germany. They intended a complete exclusion of Austria from the German Confederation, the establishment of a new confederation, with a new fundamental law, and with a federal parliament, under the protection of Prussia, and the incorporation of the more insignificant states into the larger ones. All this was to be carried out the moment Prussia entered into the ranks of constitutional monarchy, established the liberty of the press, assumed a policy independent from that of Russia and Austria, and thus enabled the constitutionalists of the lesser states to obtain a real control over their respective governments. The inventor of this scheme was Professor Gerwinus, of Heidelberg (Baden). Thus the emancipation of the Prussian bourgeoisie was to be the signal for that of the mid-

dle classes of Germany generally, and for an alliance, offensive and defensive, of both against Russia and Austria; for Austria was, as we shall see presently, considered as an entirely barbarian country, of which very little was known, and that little not to the credit of its population; Austria, therefore, was not considered as an essential part of Germany.

As to the other classes of society, in the smaller states, they followed, more or less rapidly, in the wake of their equals in Prussia. The shopkeeping class got more and more dissatisfied with their respective governments, with the increase of taxation, with the curtailments of those political sham privileges of which they used to boast when comparing themselves to the "slaves of despotism" in Austria and Prussia; but as yet they had nothing definite in their opposition which might stamp them as an independent party, distinct from the constitutionalism of the higher bourgeoisie. The dissatisfaction among the peasantry was equally growing, but it is well known that this section of the people, in quiet and peaceful times, will never assert its interests and assume its position as an independent class, except in countries where universal suffrage is established. The working classes in the trades and manufactures of the towns commenced to be infected with the "poison" of socialism and communism, but there being few towns of any importance out of Prussia, and still fewer manufacturing districts, the movement of this class, owing to the want of centers of action and propaganda, was extremely slow in the smaller states.

Both in Prussia and in the smaller states the difficulty of giving vent to political opposition created a sort of religious opposition in the parallel movements of German Catholicism and Free Congregationalism. History affords us numerous examples where, in countries which enjoy the blessings of a state church, and where political discussion is fettered, the profane and dangerous opposition against the worldly power is hid under the more sanctified and apparently more disinterested struggle against spiritual despotism. Many a



government that will not allow of any of its acts being discussed will hesitate before it creates martyrs and excites the religious fanaticism of the masses. Thus in Germany in 1845, in every state, either the Roman Catholic or the Protestant religion, or both, were considered part and parcel of the law of the land. In every state, too, the clergy of either of those denominations, or of both, formed an essential part of the bureaucratic establishment of the government. To attack Protestant or Catholic orthodoxy, to attack priestcraft, was then to make an underhand attack upon the government itself. As to the German Catholics, their very existence was an attack upon the Catholic governments of Germany, particularly Austria and Bavaria; and as such it was taken by those governments. The Free Congregationalists, Protestant dissenters, somewhat resembling the English and American Unitarians, openly professed their opposition to the clerical and rigidly orthodox tendency of the King of Prussia and his favorite Minister for the Educational and Clerical Department, Mr. Eickhorn. The two new sects, rapidly extending for a moment, the first in Catholic the second in Protestant countries, had no other distinction but their different origin; as to their tenets, they perfectly agreed upon this most important point—that all definite dogmas were nugatory. This want of any definition was their very essence; they pretended to build that great temple under the roof of which all Germans might unite; they thus represented, in a religious form, another political idea of the day—that of German unity, and yet they could never agree among themselves.

The idea of German unity, which the above-mentioned sects sought to realize, at least upon religious ground, by inventing a common religion for all Germans, manufactured expressly for their use, habits, and taste—this idea was, indeed, very widely spread, particularly in the smaller states. Ever since the dissolution of the German Empire by Napoleon, the cry for a union of all the *dissecta membra* of the German body had been the most general expression of dis-

content with the established order of things, and most so in the smaller states, where the costliness of a court, an administration, an army, in short, the dead weight of taxation, increased in a direct ratio with the smallness and impotency of the state. But what this German unity was to be when carried out was a question upon which parties disagreed. The bourgeoisie, which wanted no serious revolutionary convulsions, were satisfied with what we have seen they considered "practicable," namely, a union of all Germany, exclusive of Austria, under the supremacy of a constitutional government of Prussia; and surely, without conjuring dangerous storms, nothing more could, at that time, be done. The shop-keeping class and the peasantry, as far as these latter troubled themselves about such things, never arrived at any definition of that German unity they so loudly clamored after; a few dreamers, mostly feudal reactionists, hoped for the reestablishment of the German Empire; some few ignorant, *soi-disant* radicals, admiring Swiss institutions, of which they had not yet made that practical experience which afterwards most ludicrously undeceived them, pronounced for a federated republic; and it was only the most extreme party which, at that time, dared pronounce for a German republic, one and indivisible. Thus, German unity was in itself a question big with disunion, discord, and, in the case of certain eventualities, even civil war.

To resume, then; this was the state of Prussia, and the smaller states of Germany, at the end of 1847. The middle class, feeling their power, and resolved not to endure much longer the fetters with which a feudal and bureaucratic despotism enchained their commercial transactions, their industrial productivity, their common action as a class; a portion of the landed nobility so far changed into producers of mere marketable commodities as to have the same interests and to make common cause with the middle class; the smaller trading class, dissatisfied, grumbling at the taxes, at the impediments thrown in the way of their business, but without any

definite plan for such reforms as should secure their position in the social and political body; the peasantry, oppressed here by feudal exactions, there by moneylenders, usurers, and lawyers; the working people of the towns, infected with the general discontent, equally hating the government and the large industrial capitalists, and catching the contagion of socialist and communist ideas; in short, a heterogeneous mass of opposition, springing from various interests, but more or less led on by the bourgeoisie, in the first ranks of which again marched the bourgeoisie of Prussia, and particularly of the Rhine province. On the other hand, governments disagreeing upon many points, distrustful of each other, and particularly of that of Prussia, upon which yet they had to rely for protection; in Prussia a government forsaken by public opinion, forsaken by even a portion of the nobility, leaning upon an army and a bureaucracy which every day got more infected by the ideas, and subjected to the influence, of the oppositional bourgeoisie—a government, besides all this, penniless in the most literal meaning of the word, and which could not procure a single cent to cover its increasing deficit, but by surrendering at discretion to the opposition of the bourgeoisie. Was there ever a more splendid position for the middle class of any country, while it struggled for power against the established government?

(Engels)

## **(Austria)**

---

*Dated September 1851 / Published November 7, 1851*

We have now to consider Austria; that country which, up to March 1848, was sealed up to the eyes of foreign nations almost as much as China before the late war with England.

As a matter of course, we can here take into consideration nothing but German Austria. The affairs of the Polish, Hungarian, or Italian Austrians do not belong to our subject, and as far as they, since 1848, have influenced the fate of the German Austrians, they will have to be taken into account hereafter.

The government of Prince Metternich turned upon two hinges: firstly, to keep every one of the different nations subjected to the Austrian rule in check, by all other nations similarly conditioned; secondly, and this always has been the fundamental principle of absolute monarchies, to rely for

support upon two classes, the feudal landlords and the large stockjobbing capitalists; and to balance, at the same time, the influence and power of either of these classes by that of the other, so as to leave full independence of action to the government. The landed nobility, whose entire income consisted in feudal revenues of all sorts, could not but support a government which proved their only protection against that downtrodden class of serfs upon whose spoils they lived; and whenever the less wealthy portion of them, as in Galicia in 1846, rose in opposition against the government, Metternich in an instant let loose upon them these very serfs, who at any rate profited by the occasion to wreak a terrible vengeance upon their more immediate oppressors. On the other hand, the large capitalists of the exchange were chained to Metternich's government by the vast share they had in the public funds of the country. Austria, restored to her full power in 1815, restoring and maintaining in Italy absolute monarchy ever since 1820, freed from part of her liabilities by the bankruptcy of 1810, had, after the peace, very soon reestablished her credit in the great European money markets; and in proportion as her credit grew, she had drawn against it. Thus all the large European money dealers had engaged considerable portions of their capital in the Austrian funds: they all of them were interested in upholding the credit of that country, and as Austrian public credit, in order to be upheld, ever required new loans, they were obliged from time to time to advance new capital in order to keep up the credit of the securities for that which they already had advanced. The long peace after 1815, and the apparent impossibility of a thousand-year-old empire, like Austria, being upset, increased the credit of Metternich's government in a wonderful ratio, and made it even independent of the good will of the Vienna bankers and stockjobbers; for as long as Metternich could obtain plenty of money at Frankfort and Amsterdam, he had, of course, the satisfaction of seeing the Austrian capitalists at his feet. They were, besides, in every other re-

spect at his mercy; the large profits which bankers, stockjobbers, and government contractors always contrive to draw out of an absolute monarchy were compensated for by the almost unlimited power which the government possessed over their persons and fortunes; and not the smallest shadow of an opposition was, therefore, to be expected from this quarter. Thus Metternich was sure of the support of the two most powerful and influential classes of the empire, and he possessed besides an army and a bureaucracy, which for all purposes of absolutism could not be better constituted. The civil and military officers in the Austrian service form a race of their own; their fathers have been in the service of the Kaiser, and so will their sons be; they belong to none of the multifarious nationalities congregated under the wing of the double-headed eagle; they are, and ever have been, removed from one end of the empire to the other, from Poland to Italy, from Germany to Transylvania; Hungarian, Pole, German, Rumanian, Italian, Croat, every individual not stamped with "imperial and royal authority," etc., bearing a separate national character, is equally despised by them; they have no nationality, or rather, they alone make up the really Austrian nation. It is evident what a pliable, and at the same time powerful, instrument, in the hands of an intelligent and energetic chief, such a civil and military hierarchy must be.

As to the other classes of the population, Metternich, in the true spirit of a statesman of the *ancien régime*, cared little for their support. He had, with regard to them, but one policy: to draw as much as possible out of them in the shape of taxation, and at the same time to keep them quiet. The trading and manufacturing middle class was but of slow growth in Austria. The trade of the Danube was comparatively unimportant; the country possessed but one port, Trieste, and the trade of the port was very limited. As to the manufacturers, they enjoyed considerable protection, amounting even in most cases to the complete exclusion of all foreign competition; but this advantage had been granted to

them principally with a view to increase their tax-paying capabilities, and was in a high degree counterpoised by internal restrictions on manufactures, privileges of guilds, and other feudal corporations, which were scrupulously upheld as long as they did not impede the purposes and views of the government. The petty tradesmen were encased in the narrow bounds of these medieval guilds, which kept the different trades in a perpetual war of privilege against each other, and at the same time, by all but excluding individuals of the working class from the possibility of raising themselves in the social scale, gave a sort of hereditary stability to the members of those involuntary associations. Lastly, the peasant and the working man were treated as mere taxable matter, and the only care that was taken of them was to keep them as much as possible in the same conditions of life in which they then existed, and in which their fathers had existed before them. For this purpose every old, established, hereditary authority was upheld in the same manner as that of the state; the authority of the landlord over the petty tenant farmer, that of the manufacturer over the operative, of the small master over the journeyman and apprentice, of the father over the son, was everywhere rigidly maintained by the government, and every branch of disobedience punished the same as a transgression of the law, by that universal instrument of Austrian justice—the stick.

Finally, to wind up into one comprehensive system all these attempts at creating an artificial stability, the intellectual food allowed to the nation was selected with the minutest caution, and dealt out as sparingly as possible. Education was everywhere in the hands of the Catholic priesthood, whose chiefs, in the same manner as the large feudal landowners, were deeply interested in the conservation of the existing system. The universities were organized in a manner which allowed them to produce nothing but special men, that might or might not obtain great proficiency in sundry particular branches of knowledge, but which, at all events,

excluded that universal liberal education which other universities are expected to impart. There was absolutely no newspaper press except in Hungary, and the Hungarian papers were prohibited in all other parts of the monarchy. As to general literature, its range had not widened for a century; it had narrowed again after the death of Joseph II. And all around the frontier, wherever the Austrian states touched upon a civilized country, a cordon of literary censors was established in connection with the cordon of custom-house officials, preventing any foreign book or newspaper from passing into Austria before its contents had been twice or three times thoroughly sifted, and found pure of even the slightest contamination of the malignant spirit of the age.

For about thirty years after 1815, this system worked with wonderful success. Austria remained almost unknown to Europe, and Europe was quite as little known in Austria. The social state of every class of the population, and of the population as a whole, appeared not to have undergone the slightest change. Whatever rancor there might exist from class to class—and the existence of this rancor was for Metternich a principal condition of government, which he even fostered by making the higher classes the instruments of all government exactions, and thus throwing the odium upon them—whatever hatred the people might bear to the inferior officials of the state, there existed, upon the whole, little or no dissatisfaction with the central government. The Emperor was adored, and old Francis I seemed to be borne out by facts when, doubting of the durability of this system, he complacently added: "And yet it will hold while I live, and Metternich."

But there was a slow underground movement going on which baffled all Metternich's efforts. The wealth and influence of the manufacturing and trading middle class increased. The introduction of machinery and steam power in manufactures, upset in Austria, as it had done everywhere else, the old relations and vital conditions of whole classes of



society; it changed serfs into free men, small farmers into manufacturing operatives; it undermined the old feudal trades-corporations, and destroyed the means of existence of many of them. The new commercial and manufacturing population came everywhere into collision with the old feudal institutions. The middle classes, more and more induced by their business to travel abroad, introduced some mythical knowledge of the civilized countries situated beyond the imperial line of customs; the introduction of railways finally accelerated both the industrial and intellectual movement. There was, too, a dangerous part in the Austrian state establishment, viz., the Hungarian feudal constitution, with its parliamentary proceedings, and its struggles of the impoverished and oppositional mass of the nobility against the government and its allies, the magnates. Pressburg, the seat of the Diet, was at the very gates of Vienna. All the elements contributed to create among the middle classes of the towns a spirit, not exactly of opposition, for opposition was as yet impossible, but of discontent; a general wish for reforms, more of an administrative than of a constitutional nature. And in the same manner as in Prussia, a portion of the bureaucracy joined the bourgeoisie. Among this hereditary caste of officials the traditions of Joseph II were not forgotten; the more educated functionaries of the government, who themselves sometimes meddled with imaginary possible reforms, by far preferred the progressive and intellectual despotism of that Emperor to the "paternal" despotism of Metternich. A portion of the poorer nobility equally sided with the middle class, and as to the lower classes of the population, who always had found plenty of grounds to complain of their superiors, if not of the government, they in most cases could not but adhere to the reformatory wishes of the bourgeoisie.

It was about this time, say 1843 or 1844, that a particular branch of literature, agreeable to this change, was established in Germany. A few Austrian writers, novelists, literary

critics, bad poets, the whole of them of very indifferent ability, but gifted with that peculiar industrialism proper to the Jewish race, established themselves in Leipzig and other German towns out of Austria, and there, out of the reach of Metternich, published a number of books and pamphlets on Austrian affairs. They and their publishers made a "roaring trade" of it. All Germany was eager to become initiated into the secrets of the policy of European China; and the Austrians themselves, who obtained these publications by the wholesale smuggling carried on upon the Bohemian frontier, were still more curious. Of course the secrets let out in these publications were of no great importance, and the reform plans schemed out by their well-wishing authors bore the stamp of an innocuousness almost amounting to political virginity. A constitution and a free press for Austria were things considered unattainable; administrative reforms, extension of the rights of the provincial diets, admission of foreign books and newspapers, and a less severe censorship—the loyal and humble desires of these good Austrians did hardly go any further.

At all events the growing impossibility of preventing the literary intercourse of Austria with the rest of Germany, and through Germany with the rest of the world, contributed much toward the formation of an antigovernmental public opinion, and brought at least some little political information within the reach of part of the Austrian population. Thus, by the end of 1847 Austria was seized, although in an inferior degree, by that political and politicoreligious agitation which then prevailed in all Germany; and if its progress in Austria was more silent, it did, nevertheless, find revolutionary elements enough to work upon. There was the peasant, serf, or feudal tenant, ground down into the dust by lordly or government exactions; then the factory operative, forced by the stick of the policeman to work upon any terms the manufacturer chose to grant; then the journeyman, debarred by the corporative laws from any chance of gaining an inde-

pendence in his trade; then the merchant, stumbling at every step in business over absurd regulations; then the manufacturer, in uninterrupted conflict with trade guilds, jealous of their privileges, or with greedy and meddling officials; then the schoolmaster, the *savant*, the better educated functionary, vainly struggling against an ignorant and presumptuous clergy, or a stupid and dictating superior. In short, there was not a single class satisfied, for the small concessions government was obliged now and then to make were not made at its own expense, for the treasury could not afford that, but at the expense of the high aristocracy and clergy; and as to the great bankers and fundholders, the late events in Italy, the increasing opposition of the Hungarian Diet, and the unwonted spirit of discontent and cry for reform, manifesting themselves all over the Empire, were not of a nature to strengthen their faith in the solidity and solvency of the Austrian Empire.

Thus Austria, too, was marching slowly but surely toward a mighty change, when, of a sudden, an event broke out in France which at once brought down the impending storm and gave the lie to old Francis' assertion that the building would hold out both during his and Metternich's lifetime.

(Engels)

## **(The Vienna Insurrection)**

---

*Dated October 1851 / Published November 12, 1851*

On the 24th of February 1848, Louis Philippe was driven out of Paris, and the French Republic was proclaimed. On the 13th of March following, the people of Vienna broke the power of Prince Metternich, and made him flee shamefully out of the country. On the 18th of March the people of Berlin rose in arms, and, after an obstinate struggle of eighteen hours, had the satisfaction of seeing the King surrender himself into their hands. Simultaneous outbreaks of a more or less violent nature, but all with the same success, occurred in the capitals of the smaller states of Germany. The German people, if they had not accomplished their first revolution, were at least fairly launched into the revolutionary career.

As to the incidents of these various insurrections, we cannot enter here into the details of them: what we have to ex-

plain is their character, and the position which the different classes of the population took up with regard to them.

The revolution of Vienna may be said to have been made by an almost unanimous population. The bourgeoisie (with the exception of the bankers and stockjobbers), the petty trading class, the working people, one and all arose at once against a government detested by all, a government so universally hated that the small minority of nobles and money lords which had supported it made itself invisible on the very first attack. The middle classes had been kept in such a degree of political ignorance by Metternich that to them the news from Paris about the reign of anarchy, socialism, and terror, and about impending struggles between the class of capitalists and the class of laborers, proved quite unintelligible. They, in their political innocence, either could attach no meaning to these news, or they believed them to be fiendish inventions of Metternich, to frighten them into obedience. They, besides, had never seen workingmen acting as a class, or stand up for their own distinct class interests. They had, from their past experience, no idea of the possibility of any differences springing up between classes that now were so heartily united in upsetting a government hated by all. They saw the working people agree with themselves upon all points: a constitution, trial by jury, liberty of the press, etc. Thus they were, in March 1848 at least, heart and soul with the movement, and the movement, on the other hand, at once constituted them the (at least in theory) predominant class of the state.

But it is the fate of all revolutions that this union of different classes, which in some degree is always the necessary condition of any revolution, cannot subsist long. No sooner is the victory gained against the common enemy than the victors become divided among themselves into different camps, and turn their weapons against each other. It is this rapid and passionate development of class antagonism which, in old and complicated social organisms, makes a revolution

such a powerful agent of social and political progress; it is this incessantly quick upshooting of new parties succeeding each other in power which, during those violent commotions, makes a nation pass in five years over more ground than it would have done in a century under ordinary circumstances.

The revolution in Vienna made the middle class the theoretically predominant class; that is to say, the concessions wrung from the government were such as, once carried out practically and adhered to for a time, would inevitably have secured the supremacy of the middle class. But practically the supremacy of that class was far from being established. It is true that by the establishment of a national guard, which gave arms to the bourgeoisie and petty tradesmen, that class obtained both force and importance; it is true that by the installation of a "Committee of Safety," a sort of revolutionary, irresponsible government in which the bourgeoisie predominated, it was placed at the head of power. But, at the same time, the working classes were partially armed too; they and the students had borne the brunt of the fight, as far as fight there had been; and the students, about 4,000 strong, well-armed, and far better disciplined than the national guard, formed the nucleus, the real strength, of the revolutionary force, and were noways willing to act as a mere instrument in the hands of the Committee of Safety. Though they recognized it, and were even its most enthusiastic supporters, they yet formed a sort of independent and rather turbulent body, deliberating for themselves in the "Aula," keeping an intermediate position between the bourgeoisie and the working classes, preventing, by constant agitation, things from settling down to the old everyday tranquillity, and very often forcing their resolutions upon the Committee of Safety. The workingmen, on the other hand, almost entirely thrown out of employment, had to be employed in public works at the expense of the state, and the money for this purpose had, of course, to be taken out of the purse of the taxpayers or out of the chest of the city of Vienna. All

this could not but become very unpleasant to the tradesmen of Vienna. The manufactures of the city, calculated for the consumption of the rich and aristocratic courts of a large country, were as a matter of course entirely stopped by the revolution, by the flight of the aristocracy and court; trade was at a standstill, and the continuous agitation and excitement kept up by the students and working people was certainly not the means to "restore confidence," as the phrase went. Thus a certain coolness very soon sprung up between the middle classes on the one side and the turbulent students and working people on the other; and if for a long time this coolness was not ripened into open hostility, it was because the ministry, and particularly the court, in their impatience to restore the old order of things, constantly justified the suspicions and the turbulent activity of the more revolutionary parties, and constantly made arise, even before the eyes of the middle classes, the specter of old Metternichian despotism. Thus on the 15th of May, and again on the 26th, there were fresh risings of all classes in Vienna, on account of the government having tried to attack, or to undermine, some of the newly conquered liberties, and on each occasion the alliance between the national guard or armed middle class, the students, and the workingmen, was again cemented for a time.

As to the other classes of the population, the aristocracy and the money lords had disappeared, and the peasantry were busily engaged everywhere in removing, down to the very last vestiges of feudalism. Thanks to the war in Italy, and the occupation which Vienna and Hungary gave to the court, they were left at full liberty, and succeeded in their work of liberation in Austria better than in any other part of Germany. The Austrian Diet had very shortly after only to confirm the steps already practically taken by the peasantry, and whatever else the government of Prince Schwarzenberg may be enabled to restore, it will never have the power of reestablishing the feudal servitude of the peasantry. And if

Austria at the present moment is again comparatively tranquil, and even strong, it is principally because the great majority of the people, the peasants, have been real gainers by the revolution, and because, whatever else has been attacked by the restored government, those palpable, substantial advantages conquered by the peasantry are as yet untouched.

(Engels)



## **(The Berlin Insurrection)**

---

*Dated October 1851 / Published November 28, 1851*

The second center of revolutionary action was Berlin, and from what has been stated in the foregoing papers it may be guessed that there this action was far from having that unanimous support of almost all classes by which it was accompanied in Vienna. In Prussia, the bourgeoisie had been already involved in actual struggles with the government; a rupture had been the result of the "United Diet"; a bourgeois revolution was impending, and that revolution might have been, in its first outbreak, quite as unanimous as that of Vienna, had it not been for the Paris revolution of February. That event precipitated everything, while at the same time it was carried out under a banner totally different from that under which the Prussian bourgeoisie was preparing to defy its government. The revolution of February upset, in France,

the very same sort of government which the Prussian bourgeoisie were going to set up in their own country. The revolution of February announced itself as a revolution of the working classes against the middle classes; it proclaimed the downfall of middle-class government and the emancipation of the workingman. Now the Prussian bourgeoisie had, of late, had quite enough of working-class agitation in their own country. After the first terror of the Silesian riots had passed away, they had even tried to give this agitation a turn in their own favor; but they always had retained a salutary horror of revolutionary socialism and communism; and, therefore, when they saw men at the head of the government in Paris whom they considered as the most dangerous enemies of property, order, religion, family, and of the other *Pennates* of the modern bourgeois, they at once experienced a considerable cooling down of their own revolutionary ardor. They knew that the moment must be seized, and that, without the aid of the working masses, they would be defeated; and yet their courage failed them. Thus they sided with the government in the first partial and provincial outbreaks, tried to keep the people quiet in Berlin, who, during five days, met in crowds before the royal palace to discuss the news and ask for changes in the government; and when at last, after the news of the downfall of Metternich, the King made some slight concessions, the bourgeoisie considered the revolution as completed, and went to thank His Majesty for having fulfilled all the wishes of his people. But then followed the attack of the military on the crowd, the barricades, the struggle, and the defeat of royalty. Then everything was changed; the very working classes, which it had been the tendency of the bourgeoisie to keep in the background, had been pushed forward, had fought and conquered, and all at once were conscious of their strength. Restrictions of suffrage, of the liberty of the press, of the right to sit on juries, of the right of meeting—restrictions that would have been very agreeable to the bourgeoisie because they would

have touched upon such classes only as were beneath them—now were no longer possible. The danger of a repetition of the Parisian scenes of “anarchy” was imminent. Before this danger all former differences disappeared. Against the victorious workingman, although he had not yet uttered any specific demands for himself, the friends and the foes of many years united, and the alliance between the bourgeoisie and the supporters of the overturned system was concluded upon the very barricades of Berlin. The necessary concessions, but no more than was unavoidable, were to be made; a minority<sup>1</sup> of the opposition leaders of the United Diet was to be formed, and in return for its services in saving the crown, it was to have the support of all the props of the old government, the feudal aristocracy, the bureaucracy, the army. These were the conditions upon which Messrs. Camphausen and Hansemann undertook the formation of a cabinet.

Such was the dread evinced by the new ministers of the aroused masses that in their eyes every means was good if it only tended to strengthen the shaken foundations of authority. They, poor deluded wretches, thought every danger of a restoration of the old system had passed away; and thus they made use of the whole of the old state machinery for the purpose of restoring “order.” Not a single bureaucrat or military officer was dismissed; not the slightest change was made in the old bureaucratic system of administration. These precious constitutional and responsible ministers even restored to their posts those functionaries whom the people, in the first heat of revolutionary ardor, had driven away on account of their former acts of bureaucratic overbearing. There was nothing altered in Prussia but the persons of the ministers; even the ministerial staffs in the different departments were not touched upon, and all the constitutional place-hunters, who had formed the chorus of the newly elevated rulers, and who had expected their share of power and office, were told to wait until restored stability allowed changes to be oper-

<sup>1</sup> Apparently a misprint; Engels must have meant “ministry.”

ated in the bureaucratic personnel which now were not without danger.

The King, chapfallen in the highest degree after the insurrection of the 18th March, very soon found out that he was quite as necessary to these "liberal" ministers as they were to him. The throne had been spared by the insurrection; the throne was the last existing obstacle to "anarchy"; the liberal middle class and its leaders, now in the ministry, had therefore every interest to keep on excellent terms with the crown. The King, and the reactionary *camarilla* that surrounded him, were not slow in discovering this, and profited by the circumstance in order to fetter the march of the ministry even in those petty reforms that were from time to time intended.

The first care of the ministry was to give a sort of legal appearance to the recent violent changes. The United Diet was convoked, in spite of all popular opposition, in order to vote as the legal and constitutional organ of the people a new electoral law for the election of an assembly, which was to agree with the crown upon a new constitution. The elections were to be indirect, the mass of voters electing a number of electors, who then were to choose the representative. In spite of all opposition this system of double elections passed. The United Diet was then asked for a loan of twenty-five millions of dollars, opposed by the popular party, but equally agreed to.

These acts of the ministry gave a most rapid development to the popular, or as it now called itself, the Democratic party. This party, headed by the petty trading and shopkeeping class, and uniting under its banner, in the beginning of the revolution, the large majority of the working people, demanded direct and universal suffrage, the same as established in France, a single legislative assembly, and full and open recognition of the revolution of the 18th March, as the base of the new governmental system. The more moderate faction would be satisfied with a thus "democratized" monar-

chy, the more advanced demanded the ultimate establishment of the republic. Both factions agreed in recognizing the German National Assembly at Frankfort as the supreme authority of the country, while the constitutionalists and reactionists affected a great horror of the sovereignty of this body, which they professed to consider as utterly revolutionary.

The independent movement of the working classes had, by the revolution, been broken up for a time. The immediate wants and circumstances of the movement were such as not to allow any of the specific demands of the proletarian party to be put in the foreground. In fact, as long as the ground was not cleared for the independent action of the workingmen, as long as direct and universal suffrage was not yet established, as long as the thirty-six larger and smaller states continued to cut up Germany into numberless morsels, what else could the proletarian party do but watch the—for them all-important—movement of Paris, and struggle in common with the petty shopkeepers for the attainment of those rights which would allow them to fight afterwards their own battle?

There were only three points, then, by which the proletarian party in its political action essentially distinguished itself from the petty trading class, or properly so-called Democratic party; firstly, in judging differently the French movement, with regard to which the Democrats attacked, and the proletarian revolutionists defended, the extreme party in Paris; secondly, in proclaiming the necessity of establishing a German republic, one and indivisible, while the very extremist ultras among the Democrats only dared to sigh for a federative republic; and thirdly, in showing upon every occasion that revolutionary boldness and readiness for action in which any party headed by, and composed principally of, petty tradesmen, will always be deficient.

The proletarian, or really revolutionary, party succeeded only very gradually in withdrawing the mass of the working

people from the influence of the Democrats, whose tail they formed in the beginning of the revolution. But in due time the indecision, weakness, and cowardice of the Democratic leaders did the rest, and it may now be said to be one of the principal results of the last years' convulsions that, wherever the working class is concentrated in anything like considerable masses, they are entirely freed from that Democratic influence which led them into an endless series of blunders and misfortunes during 1848 and 1849. But we had better not anticipate; the events of these two years will give us plenty of opportunities to show the Democratic gentlemen at work.

The peasantry in Prussia, the same as in Austria, but with less energy, feudalism pressing, upon the whole, not quite so hard upon them here, had profited by the revolution to free themselves at once from all feudal shackles. But here, from the reasons stated before, the middle classes at once turned against them, their oldest, their most indispensable allies; the Democrats, equally frightened with the bourgeoisie, by what was called attacks upon private property, failed equally to support them; and thus, after three months' emancipation, after bloody struggles and military executions, particularly in Silesia, feudalism was restored by the hands of the, until yesterday, antifeudal bourgeoisie. There is not a more damning fact to be brought against them than this. Similar treason against its best allies, against itself, never was committed by any party in history, and whatever humiliation and chastisement may be in store for this middle class party it has deserved by this one act every morsel of it.

(Engels)

## **Corruption at Elections**

---

*Dated August 20, 1852 / Published September 4, 1852*

Just before the late House of Commons separated, it resolved to heap up as many difficulties as possible for its successors in their way to Parliament. It voted a Draconian law against bribery, corruption, intimidation, and electioneering sharp practices in general.

A long list of questions is drawn up, which, by this enactment, may be put to petitioners or sitting members, the most searching and stringent that can be conceived. They may be required on oath to state who were their agents, and what communications they held with them. They may be asked and compelled to state, not only what they know, but what they "believe, conjecture, and suspect," as to money expended either by themselves or anyone else acting—authorized or not authorized—on their behalf. In a word, no mem-

ber can go through the strange ordeal without risk of perjury, if he have the slightest idea that it is possible or likely that anyone has been led to overstep on his behalf the limits of the law.

Now, even supposing this law to take it for granted that the new legislators will use the same liberty as the clergy, who only believe *some* of the Thirty-Nine Articles, yet contrive to sign them *all*, yet there remain, nevertheless, clauses sufficient to make the new Parliament the most virginal assembly that ever made speeches and passed laws for the three kingdoms. And in juxtaposition with the general election immediately following, this law secures to the Tories the glory that under their administration the greatest purity of election has been theoretically proclaimed, and the greatest amount of electoral corruption has been practically carried out.

A fresh election is proceeded with, and here a scene of *bribery, corruption, violence, drunkenness and murder* ensues, *unparalleled* since the times of the old Tory monopoly reigned supreme before. We actually hear of soldiers with loaded guns, and bayonets fixed, taking Liberal electors by force, dragging them under the landlord's eyes to vote against their own consciences, and these soldiers shooting with deliberate aim the people who dared to sympathize with the captive electors, and committing wholesale murder on the unresisting people! [Allusion to the event at Six Mile Bridge, Limerick, County Clare.] It may be said: That was in Ireland! Ay, and in England they have employed their police to break the stalls of those opposed to them; they have sent their organized gangs of midnight ruffians prowling through the streets to intercept and intimidate the Liberal electors; they have opened the cesspools of drunkenness; they have showered the gold of corruption, as at Derby, and in almost every contested place they have exercised systematic intimidation.

Thus far Ernest Jones's *People's Paper*. Now, after this Chartist weekly paper, hear the weekly paper of the opposite



party, the most sober, the most rational, the most moderate organ of the industrial bourgeoisie, the London *Economist*:

We believe we may affirm, at this general election, there has been more *truckling*, more *corruption*, more *intimidation*, more *fanaticism* and more *debauchery* than on any previous occasion. It is reported that bribery has been more extensively resorted to at this election than for many previous years. . . . Of the amount of intimidation and undue influence of every sort which has been practised at the late election, it is probably impossible to form an exaggerated estimate. . . . And when we sum up all these things—the brutal drunkenness, the low intrigues, the wholesale corruption, the barbarous intimidation, the integrity of candidates warped and stained, the honest electors who are ruined, the feeble ones who are suborned and dishonored; the lies, the stratagems, the slanders, which stalk abroad in the daylight, naked and not ashamed—the desecration of holy words, the soiling of noble names—we stand aghast at the holocaust of victims, of destroyed bodies and lost souls, on whose funeral pile a new Parliament is reared.

The means of corruption and intimidation were the usual ones: direct government influence. Thus on an electioneering agent at Derby, arrested in the flagrant act of bribing, a letter was found from Major Beresford, the Secretary at War, wherein that same Beresford opens a credit upon a commercial firm for electioneering moneys. *The Poole Herald* publishes a circular from the Admiralty House to the half-pay officers, signed by the commander-in-chief of a naval station, requesting their votes for the ministerial candidates.—Direct force of arms has also been employed, as at Cork, Belfast, Limerick (at which latter place eight persons were killed).—Threats of ejectment by landlords against their farmers, unless they voted with them. The land agents of Lord Derby herein gave the example to their colleagues.—Threats of exclusive dealing against shopkeepers, of dismissal against workmen, intoxication, etc., etc.—To these *profane* means of corruption *spiritual* ones were added by the Tories; the royal

proclamation against Roman Catholic processions was issued in order to inflame bigotry and religious hatred; the no-popery cry was raised everywhere. One of the results of this proclamation were the Stockport riots. The Irish priests, of course, retorted with similar weapons.

The election is hardly over, and already a single Queen's Counsel has received from twenty-five places instructions to invalidate the returns to Parliament on account of bribery and intimidation. Such petitions against elected members have been signed, and the expenses of the proceedings raised at Derby, Cockermouth, Barstaple, Harwich, Canterbury, Yarmouth, Wakefield, Boston, Huddersfield, Windsor, and a great number of other places. Of eight to ten Derbyite members it is proved that, even under the most favorable circumstances, they will be rejected on petition.

The principal scenes of this bribery, corruption and intimidation were, of course, the agricultural counties and the Peers' Boroughs, for the conservation of the greatest possible number of which latter the Whigs had expended all their acumen in the Reform Bill of 1831. The constituencies of large towns and of densely populated manufacturing counties were, by their peculiar circumstances, very unfavorable ground for such maneuvers.

Days of general election are in Britain traditionally the bacchanalia of drunken debauchery, conventional stockjobbing terms for the discounting of political consciences, the richest harvest times of the publicans. As an English paper says, "these recurring *saturnalia* never fail to leave enduring traces of their pestilential presence." Quite naturally so. They are saturnalia in the ancient Roman sense of the word. The master then turned servant, the servant turned master. If the servant be master for one day, on that day brutality will reign supreme. The masters were the grand dignitaries of the ruling classes, or sections of classes, the servants formed the mass of these same classes, the privileged electors encircled by the mass of the nonelectors, of those thousands

that had no other calling than to be mere hangers-on, and whose support, vocal or manual, always appeared desirable, were it only on account of the theatrical effect.

If you follow up the history of British elections for a century past or longer, you are tempted to ask, not why British Parliaments were so bad, but on the contrary, how they managed to be even as good as they were, and to represent as much as they did, though in a dim refraction, the actual movement of British society. Just as opponents of the representative system must feel surprised on finding that legislative bodies in which the abstract majority, the accident of the mere number, is decisive, yet decide and resolve according to the necessities of the situation—at least during the period of their full vitality. It will always be impossible, even by the utmost straining of logical deductions, to derive from the relations of mere numbers the necessity of a vote in accordance with the actual state of things; but from a given state of things the necessity of certain relations of members will always follow as of itself. The traditional bribery of British elections—what else was it, but another form, as brutal as it was popular, in which the relative strength of the contending parties showed itself? Their respective means of influence and of dominion, which on other occasions they used in a *normal* way, were here enacted for a few days in an abnormal and more or less burlesque manner. But the premise remained that the candidates of the rivaling parties represented the interests of the mass of the electors, and that the privileged electors again represented the interests of the non-voting mass, or rather, that this voteless mass had, as yet, no specific interest of its own. The Delphic priestesses had to become intoxicated by vapors to enable them to find oracles; the British people must intoxicate itself with gin and porter to enable it to find its oracle-finders, the legislators. And where these oracle-finders were to be looked for, that was a matter of course.

This relative position of classes and parties underwent a

radical change from the moment the industrial and commercial middle classes, the bourgeoisie, took up its stand as an official party at the side of the Whigs and Tories, and especially from the passing of the Reform Bill in 1831. These bourgeois were in no wise fond of costly electioneering maneuvers, of *faux frais* of general elections. They considered it cheaper to compete with the landed aristocracy by general moral than by personal pecuniary means. On the other hand they were conscious of representing a universally predominant interest of modern society. They were, therefore, in a position to demand that electors should be ruled by their common national interests, not by personal and local motives, and the more they recurred to this postulate, the more the latter species of electoral influence was, by the very composition of constituencies, centered in the landed aristocracy, but withheld from the middle classes. Thus the bourgeoisie contended for the principle of moral elections and forced the enactment of laws in that sense, intended, each of them, as safeguards against the local influence of the landed aristocracy; and indeed, from 1831 down, bribery adopted a more civilized, more hidden, form, and general elections went off in a more sober way than before. When at last the mass of the people ceased to be a mere chorus, taking a more or less impassioned part in the struggle of the official heroes, drawing the lots among them, rioting, in bacchantic carouse, at the creation of parliamentary divinities, like the Cretan centaurs at the birth of Jupiter, and taking pay and treat for such participation in their glory—when the Chartists surrounded in threatening masses the whole circle within which the official election struggle must come off, and watched with scrutinizing mistrust every movement taking place within it—then an election like that of 1852 could not but call for universal indignation, and elicit even from the conservative *Times*, for the first time, some words in favor of general suffrage, and make the whole mass of the British proletariat shout as with one voice. The foes of reform, they have given

reformers the best arguments; such is an election under the class system; such is a House of Commons with such a system of election!

In order to comprehend the character of bribery, corruption and intimidation, such as they have been practiced in the late election, it is necessary to call attention to a fact which operated in a parallel direction.

If you refer to the general elections since 1831, you will find that, in the same measure as the pressure of the voteless majority of the country upon the privileged body of electors was increasing, as the demand was heard louder, from the middle classes for an extension of the circle of constituencies, from the working class to extinguish every trace of a similar privileged circle—that in the same measure the number of electors who actually voted grew less and less, and the constituencies thus more and more contracted themselves. Never was this fact more striking than in the late election.

Let us take, for instance, London. In the City the constituency numbers 26,728; only 10,000 voted. The Tower Hamlets number 23,534 registered electors; only 12,000 voted. In Finsbury, of 20,025 electors, not one-half voted. In Liverpool, the scene of one of the most animated contests, of 17,433 registered electors, only 13,000 came to the polls.

These examples will suffice. What do they prove? The apathy of the privileged constituencies. And this apathy, what proves it? That they have outlived themselves—that they have lost every interest in their own political existence. This is in no wise apathy against politics in general, but against a species of politics the result of which, for the most part, can only consist in helping the Tories to oust the Whigs, or the Whigs to conquer the Tories. The constituencies feel instinctively that the decision lies no longer either with Parliament or with the making of Parliament. Who repealed the Corn Laws? Assuredly not the voters who had elected a protectionist Parliament, still less the protectionist Parliament itself, but only and exclusively the pressure from without. In

this pressure from without, in other means of influencing Parliament than by voting, a great portion even of the voters now believe. They consider the hitherto lawful mode of voting as an antiquated formality, but from the moment Parliament should make front against the pressure from without, and dictate laws to the nation in the sense of its narrow constituencies, they would join the general assault against the whole antiquated system of machinery.

The bribery and intimidation practiced by the Tories were, then, merely violent experiments for bringing back to life dying electoral bodies which have become incapable of production, and which can no longer create decisive electoral results and really national Parliaments. And the result? The old Parliament was dissolved, because at the end of its career it had dissolved into sections which brought each other to a complete standstill. The new Parliament begins where the old one ended; it is paralytic from the hour of its birth.

(Marx)

## **Elections—Financial Clouds— The Duchess of Sutherland and Slavery**

---

*Dated January 21, 1853 / Published February 9, 1853*

The reelections consequent upon the new ministerial arrangements are finished. Ministers have suffered a defeat, Mr. Sadleir, one of the Lords of the Treasury, and hitherto considered the chief of the "Irish Brigade," having been beaten by Mr. Alexander, who was elected by a majority of six votes. Mr. Alexander owes his election to a coalition of the Orangemen and the Catholics. On the other hand, ministers were victorious at Oxford University, where the poll lasted fifteen days and the struggle was extremely animated. Gladstone carried the day by a majority of 124 against Dudley Percival, the candidate of the High Church Party. To amateurs of Hudibrasian logic we can recommend the leaders of the two contending journals in this struggle, *The Morning Chronicle* and *The Morning Herald*.

Yesterday, after a long debate, the Directors of the Bank of England again raised the minimum rate of discount from  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to 3 per cent. This circumstance had an immediate effect upon the Paris Bourse, where all sorts of securities had to submit to another decline. But if the Bank of England should succeed in checking speculation at Paris, there will remain open another outlet for the drain of bullion: the imports of corn. The last harvest both in England and on the Continent is estimated at one-third below the average. Besides, there exists some doubt as to the quantity of food available for consumption until next harvest, in consequence of the delay in sowing the seed caused by the wet state of the soil. Therefore, large imports of grain are arranged for, and will continue to keep the course of exchange unfavorable for England. The gold ships from Australia cannot keep pace with the sudden augmentation of grain imports.

In one of my late letters I mentioned the speculation going on in iron. The first raising of the rate of discount, by the Bank, from 2 to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, had already had its effect upon this branch of trade. Scotch pigs, for the last fortnight selling at 78 shillings, on the nineteenth of this month dropped down to 61 shillings. The Radway share market, too, will probably be depressed since the raising of the rate of interest, by forced sales of shares hitherto deposited as securities for loans, and the commencement of these operations has already taken place. My opinion, however, is that the drain of bullion is not caused by exportation of gold alone, but that the brisk home trade, especially in the manufacturing districts, has a full share in it.

During the present momentary slackness in political affairs, the address of the Stafford House Assembly of Ladies to their sisters in America upon the subject of Negro slavery,



and the "affectionate and Christian address of many thousands of the women of the United States of America to their sisters, the women of England," upon white slavery, have proved a godsend to the press. Not one of the British papers was ever struck by the circumstance that the Stafford House Assembly took place at the palace and under the presidency of the Duchess of Sutherland, and yet the names of Stafford and Sutherland should have been sufficient to class the philanthropy of the British aristocracy—a philanthropy which chooses its subjects as far distant from home as possible, and rather on that than on this side of the ocean.

The history of the wealth of the Sutherland family is the history of the ruin and of the expropriation of the Scotch Gaelic population from its native soil. As far back as the tenth century the Danes had landed in Scotland, conquered the plains of Caithness, and driven back the aborigines into the mountains. Mheor-Thair-Chattaibh,<sup>1</sup> as he was called in Gaelic, or the "Great Man of Sutherland," had always found his companions in arms ready to defend him at the risk of their lives against all his enemies, Danes or Scots, foreigners or natives. After the revolution which drove the Stuarts from Britain, private feuds among the petty chieftains of Scotland became less and less frequent, and the British kings, in order to keep up at least a semblance of dominion in these remote districts, encouraged the levying of family regiments among the chieftains, a system by which these lairds were enabled to combine modern military establishments with the ancient clan system in such a manner as to support one by the other.

Now, in order to distinctly appreciate the usurpation subsequently carried out, we must first properly understand what the clan meant. The clan belonged to a form of social existence which, in the scale of historical development, stands a full degree below the feudal state; viz., the *patriarchal* state of society. *Klaen* in Gaelic means children. Every

<sup>1</sup> This spelling and the different one that follows are both Marx's—or the *Tribune's*.

one of the usages and traditions of the Scottish Gaels reposes upon the supposition that the members of the clan belong to one and the same family. The "great man," the chieftain of the clan, is on the one hand quite as arbitrary, on the other quite as confined in his power, by consanguinity, etc., as every father of a family. To the clan, to the family, belonged the district where it had established itself, exactly as, in Russia, the land occupied by a community of peasants belongs, not to the individual peasants, but to the community. Thus the district was the common property of the family. There could be no more question, under this system, of private property, in the modern sense of the word, than there could be of comparing the social existence of the members of the clan to that of individuals living in the midst of our modern society. The division and subdivision of the land corresponded to the military functions of the single members of the clan. According to their military abilities, the chieftain entrusted to them the several allotments, canceled or enlarged according to his pleasure the tenures of the individual officers, and these officers again distributed to their vassals and undervassals every separate plot of land. But the district at large always remained the property of the clan, and, however the claims of individuals might vary, the tenure remained the same; nor were the contributions for the common defense, or the tribute for the laird, who at once was leader in battle and chief magistrate in peace, ever increased. Upon the whole, every plot of land was cultivated by the same family, from generation to generation, under fixed imposts. These imposts were insignificant, more a tribute by which the supremacy of the "great man" and of his officers was acknowledged than a rent of land in the modern sense, or a source of revenue. The officers directly subordinate to the "great man" were called *taksmen*, and the district entrusted to their care, *tak*. Under them were placed inferior officers, at the head of every hamlet, and under these stood the peasantry.

Thus you see, the clan is nothing but a family organized in a military manner, quite as little defined by laws, just as closely hemmed in by traditions, as any family. But the land is the *property of the family*, in the midst of which differences of rank, in spite of consanguinity, do prevail as well as in all the ancient Asiatic family communities.

The first usurpation took place, after the expulsion of the Stuarts, by the establishment of the family regiments. From that moment, *pay* became the principal source of revenue of the "great man," the Mhoir-Fhear-Chattaibh. Entangled in the dissipation of the court of London, he tried to squeeze as much money as possible out of his officers, and they applied the same system to their inferiors. The ancient tribute was transformed into fixed money contracts. In one respect these contracts constituted a progress, by fixing the traditional imposts; in another respect they were a usurpation, inasmuch as the "great man" now took the position of landlord toward the *taksmen*, who again took toward the peasantry that of farmers. And as the "great man" now required money no less than the *taksmen*, a production not only for direct consumption but for export and exchange also became necessary: the system of national production had to be changed, the hands superseded by this change had to be got rid of. Population, therefore, decreased. But that it as yet was kept up in a certain manner, and that man, in the eighteenth century, was not yet openly sacrificed to net revenue, we see from a passage in Steuart, a Scotch political economist, whose work was published ten years before Adam Smith's, where he says (Vol. 1, chap. 16): "The rent of these lands is very trifling compared to their extent, but compared to the number of mouths which a farm maintains, it will perhaps be found that a plot of land in the highlands of Scotland feeds ten times more people than a farm of the same extent in the richest provinces." That even in the beginning of the nineteenth century the rental imposts were very small is shown by the work of Mr. Lock (1820), the steward of the Countess of Suther-

land, who directed the improvements on her estates. He gives for instance the rental of the Kintradawell estate for 1811, from which it appears that up to then every family was obliged to pay a yearly impost of a few shillings in money, a few fowls, and some days' work, at the highest.

It was only after 1811 that the ultimate and real usurpation was enacted, the forcible transformation of *clan property* into the *private property*, in the modern sense, of the *chief*. The person who stood at the head of this economic revolution was a female Mehemet Ali, who had well digested her Malthus—the *Countess of Sutherland*, alias *Marchioness of Stafford*.

Let us first state that the ancestors of the Marchioness of Stafford were the "great men" of the most northern part of Scotland, of very near three-quarters of Sutherlandshire. This county is more extensive than many French *départements* or small German principalities. When the Countess of Sutherland inherited these estates, which she afterward brought to her husband, the Marquis of Stafford, afterward Duke of Sutherland, the population of them was already reduced to 15,000. My lady Countess resolved upon a radical economical reform, and determined upon transforming the whole tract of country into sheepwalks. From 1814 to 1820, these 15,000 inhabitants, about 3,000 families, were systematically expelled and exterminated. All their villages were demolished and burned down, and all their fields converted into pasturage. British soldiers were commanded for this execution, and came to blows with the natives. An old woman refusing to quit her hut was burned in the flames of it. Thus my lady Countess appropriated to herself *seven hundred and ninety-four thousand acres of land*, which from time immemorial had belonged to the clan. In the exuberance of her generosity she allotted to the expelled natives about 6,000 acres—2 acres per family. These 6,000 acres had been lying waste until then, and brought no revenue to the proprietors.

The Countess was generous enough to sell the acre at two shillings and sixpence, on an average, to the clan-men who for centuries past had shed their blood for her family. The whole of the unrightfully appropriated clan land she divided into 29 large sheep farms, each of them inhabited by one single family, mostly English farm laborers; and in 1821 the 15,000 Gaels had already been superseded by 131,000 sheep.

A portion of the aborigines had been thrown upon the sea-shore, and attempted to live by fishing. They became amphibious, and, as an English author says, lived half on land and half on water, and after all did not half live upon both.

Sismondi, in his *Études Sociales*, observes with regard to this expropriation of the Gaels from Sutherlandshire—an example, which, by the by, was imitated by the other “great men” of Scotland:

The large extent of seignorial domains is not a circumstance peculiar to Britain. In the whole Empire of Charlemagne, in the whole occident, entire provinces were usurped by the war-like chiefs, who had them cultivated for their own account by the vanquished, and sometimes by their own companions in arms. During the ninth and tenth centuries the Counties of Maine, Anjou, Poitou were for the counts of these provinces rather three large estates than principalities. Switzerland, which in so many respects resembles Scotland, was at that time divided among a small number of *seigneurs*. If the counts of Kyburg, of Lantzburg, of Hatsburg, of Gruyères, had been protected by British laws, they would have been in the same position as the earls of Sutherland; some of them would perhaps have had the same taste for improvement as the Marchioness of Stafford, and more than one republic might have disappeared from the ages to make room for flocks of sheep. Not the most despotic monarch in Germany would be allowed to attempt anything of the sort.

Mr. Lock, in his defense of the Countess of Sutherland (1820), replies to the above as follows:

Why should there be made an exception to the rule adopted in every other case, just for this particular case? Why should the absolute authority of the landlord over his land be sacrificed to the public interest and to motives which concern the public only?

And why, then, should the slaveholders in the Southern states of North America sacrifice their private interest to the philanthropic grimaces of her Grace, the Duchess of Sutherland?

The British aristocracy, who have everywhere superseded man by bullocks and sheep, will, in a future not very distant, be superseded, in turn, by these useful animals.

The process of *clearing estates* which, in Scotland, we have just now described, was carried out in England in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Thomas More already complains of it in the beginning of the sixteenth century. It was performed in Scotland in the beginning of the nineteenth, and in Ireland it is now in full progress. The noble Viscount Palmerston, too, some years ago cleared of men his property in Ireland, exactly in the manner described above.

If of any property it was ever true that it was *robbery*,<sup>2</sup> it is literally true of the property of the British aristocracy. Robbery of Church property, robbery of commons, fraudulent transformation, accompanied by murder, of feudal and patriarchal property into private property—these are the titles of British aristocrats to their possessions. And what services in this latter process were performed by a servile class of lawyers you may see from an English lawyer of the last century, Dalrymple, who in his *History of Feudal Property* very naively proves that every law or deed concerning property was interpreted by the lawyers in England, when the middle class rose in wealth, in favor of the *middle class*—in Scotland, where the nobility enriched themselves, in favor of

<sup>2</sup> Proudhon's book *What Is Property?* (1840) began with a question and a reply: "What is property?" "Property is robbery."

the *nobility*—in either case it was interpreted in a sense hostile to the *people*.

The above Turkish reform by the Countess of Sutherland was justifiable, at least, from a Malthusian point of view. Other Scottish noblemen went further. Having superseded human beings by sheep, they superseded sheep by game, and the pasture grounds by forests. At the head of these was the Duke of Athol. "After the conquest, the Norman Kings afforested large portions of the soil of England, in much the same way as the landlords here are now doing with the Highlands." (R. Somer's *Letters on the Highlands*, 1848.)

As for a large number of the human beings expelled to make room for the game of the Duke of Athol, and the sheep of the Countess of Sutherland, where did they fly to, where did they find a home?

*In the United States of North America.*

The enemy of British wages slavery has a right to condemn Negro slavery; a Duchess of Sutherland, a Duke of Athol, a Manchester cotton lord—never!

(Marx)

# **Parliamentary Debates—The Clergy and the Struggle for the Ten-Hour Day—Starvation**

---

*Dated February 25, 1853 / Published March 15, 1853*

The parliamentary debates of the week offer but little of interest. On the 22nd inst. Mr. Spooner moved, in the House of Commons, the repeal of the money grants for the Catholic College at Maynooth, and Mr. Scholefield proposed the amendment "to repeal all enactments now in force, whereby the revenue of the State is charged in aid of any ecclesiastical or religious purpose whatever." Mr. Spooner's motion was lost by 162 to 192 votes. Mr. Scholefield's amendment will not come under discussion before Wednesday next; it is, however, not improbable that the amendment will be withdrawn altogether. The only remarkable passage in the Maynooth debate is an observation that fell from Mr. Duffy (Irish Brigade)<sup>1</sup>: "He did not think it wholly impossible

<sup>1</sup> Irishmen in the British Parliament.



that the President of the United States or the new Emperor of the French might be glad to renew the relations between those countries and the Irish priesthood."

In the session of last night Lord John Russell brought before the House of Commons his motion for the "removal of some disabilities of Her Majesty's Jewish subjects." The motion was carried by a majority of 29. Thus the question is again settled in the House of Commons, but there is no doubt that it will be once more unsettled in the House of Lords.

The exclusion of Jews from the House of Commons, after the spirit of usury has so long presided in the British Parliament, is unquestionably an absurd anomaly, the more so as they have already become eligible to all the civil offices of the community. But it remains no less characteristic for the man and *for his times* that, instead of a Reform Bill which was promised to remove the disabilities of the mass of the English people, a bill is brought in by Finality John<sup>2</sup> for the exclusive removal of the disabilities of Baron Lionel de Rothschild. How utterly insignificant an interest is taken in this affair by the public at large may be inferred from the fact that from not a single place in Great Britain a petition in favor of the admission of Jews has been forwarded to Parliament. The whole secret of this miserable reform farce was betrayed by the speech of the present Sir Robert Peel.

After all, the House were only considering the noble Lord's private affairs. [Loud cheers.] The noble Lord represented London with a Jew, [cheers] and had made the pledge to bring forward annually a motion in favor of the Jews. [Hear!] No doubt Baron Rothschild was a very wealthy man, but this did not entitle him to any consideration, especially considering how his wealth had been amassed. [Loud cries of "hear, hear," and "Oh! Oh!" from the ministerial benches.] Only yesterday he had read in the papers that the House of Rothschild had

<sup>2</sup> "Finality John" was the nickname given to Lord John Russell after he declared that the Reform Act of 1832 represented "the final development of the British Constitution."

consented to grant a loan to Greece, on considerable guaranties, at 9 per cent. [Hear!] No wonder, at this rate, that the house of Rothschild were wealthy. [Hear.] The President of the Board of Trade had been talking of gagging the press. Why, no one had done so much to depress freedom in Europe as the house of Rothschild [Hear, hear!] by the loans with which they assisted the despotic powers. But even supposing the Baron to be as worthy a man as he was certainly rich, it was to have been expected that the noble Lord who represented in that House a government consisting of the leaders of all the political factions who had opposed the late Administration would have proposed some measure of more importance than the present.

The proceedings on election petitions have commenced. The elections for Canterbury and Lancaster have been declared null and void, under circumstances which proved the habitual venality on the part of a certain class of electors, but it is pretty sure that the majority of cases will be adjusted by way of compromise.

"The privileged classes," says *The Daily News*, "who have successfully contributed to baffle the intentions of the Reform Bill and to recover their ascendancy in the existing representation, are naturally alarmed at the idea of full and complete exposure."

On the 21st inst., Lord John Russell resigned the seals of the Foreign Office, and Lord Clarendon was sworn in as his successor. Lord John is the first member of the House of Commons admitted to a seat in the cabinet without any official appointment. He is now only a favorite adviser, without a place—and without salary. Notice, however, has already been given by Mr. Kelly of a proposition to remedy the latter inconvenience of poor Johnny's situation. The Secretaryship of Foreign Affairs is at the present juncture the more important, as the Germanic Diet has bestirred itself to ask the removal of all political refugees from Great Britain, as the Aus-

trians propose to pack us all up and transport us to some barren island in the South Pacific.

Allusion has been made, in a former letter, to the probability of the Irish Tenant Right agitation becoming, in time, an anticlerical movement, notwithstanding the views and intentions of its actual leaders. I alleged the fact that the higher clergy was already beginning to take a hostile attitude with regard to the League.<sup>3</sup> Another force has since stepped into the field which presses the movement in the same direction. The landlords of the north of Ireland endeavor to persuade their tenantry that the Tenant League and the Catholic Defense Association<sup>4</sup> are identical, and they labor to get up an opposition to the former under the pretense of resisting the progress of popery.

While we thus see the Irish landlords appealing to their tenants against the Catholic clergy we behold on the other hand the English Protestant clergy appealing to the working classes against the mill lords. The industrial proletariat of England has renewed with double vigor its old campaign for the Ten-Hours' Bill and against the *truck and shoppage system*. As the demands of this kind shall be brought before the House of Commons, to which numerous petitions on the subject have already been presented, there will be an opportunity for me to dwell in a future letter on the cruel and infamous practices of the factory despots, who are in the habit of making the press and the tribune resound with their liberal rhetorics. For the present it may suffice to recall to memory that from 1802 there has been a continual strife on the part of the English working people for legislative interference with the duration of factory labor, until in 1847 the cele-

<sup>3</sup> The Tenant Right League, founded in 1850 by a group of Irish Liberals, advocated agrarian reforms and was opposed by the clergy.

<sup>4</sup> Founded in 1823 by Daniel O'Connell, leader of the Irish Liberals, the Association worked closely with the clergy.

brated Ten-Hours' Act of John Fielden was passed, whereby young persons and females were prohibited to work in any factory longer than ten hours a day. The liberal mill lords speedily found out that under this Act factories might be worked by shifts and relays. In 1849 an action of law was brought before the Court of Exchequer, and the judge decided that to work the relay or shift system with two sets of children, the adults working the whole space of time during which the machinery was running, was legal. It therefore became necessary to go to Parliament again, and in 1850 the relay and shift system was condemned there, but the Ten-Hours' Act was transformed into a Ten-and-a-Half-Hours' Act. Now, at this moment, the working classes demand a restitution *in integrum* of the original Ten-Hours' Bill; yet, in order to make it efficient, they add the demand of a restriction of the moving power of machinery.

Such is, in short, the exoteric history of the Ten-Hours' Act. Its secret history was as follows: The landed aristocracy having suffered a defeat from the bourgeoisie by the passing of the Reform Bill of 1831, and being assailed in "their most sacred interests" by the cry of the manufacturers for free trade and the abolition of the Corn Laws, resolved to resist the middle class by espousing the cause and claims of the workingmen against their masters, and especially by rallying around their demands for the limitation of factory labor. So called philanthropic lords were then at the head of all Ten-Hours' meetings. Lord Ashley has even made a sort of *renommée* by his performances in this movement. The landed aristocracy having received a deadly blow by the actual abolition of the Corn Laws in 1846, took their vengeance by forcing the Ten-Hours' Bill of 1847 upon Parliament. But the industrial bourgeoisie recovered by judiciary authority what they had lost by parliamentary legislation. In 1850, the wrath of the landlords had gradually subsided, and they made a compromise with the mill lords, condemning the shift system, but imposing at the same time, as a penalty for

the enforcement of the law, half an hour extra work *per diem* on the working classes. At the present juncture, however, as they feel the approach of their final struggle with the men of the Manchester School, they are again trying to get hold of the short-time movement; but, not daring to come forward themselves, they endeavor to undermine the cotton lords by directing the popular force against them through the medium of the *State Church Clergymen*. In what rude manner these holy men have taken the anti-industrial crusade into their hands may be seen from the following few instances. At Crampton a Ten-Hours' meeting was held, the Rev. Dr. Brammell [of the State Church], in the chair. At this meeting, Rev. J. R. Stephens, incumbent of Stalybridge, said:

There had been ages in the world when the nations were governed by Theocracy. . . . That state of things is now no more. . . . Still the spirit of law was the same. . . . The labouring man should, first of all, be partaker of the fruits of the earth, which he was the means of producing. The factory-law was so unblushingly violated that the Chief Inspector of that part of the factory district, Mr. Leonard Horner, had found himself necessitated to write to the Home Secretary, to say that he dared not, and would not send any of his Sub-Inspectors into certain districts until he had police protection. . . . And protection against whom? Against the factory-masters! Against the richest men in the district, against the most influential men in the district, against the magistrates of the district, against the men who hold her Majesty's Commission, against the men who sat in the Petty Sessions as the Representatives of Royalty. . . . *And did the masters suffer for their violation of the law?* . . . In his own district, it was a settled custom of the male, and to a great extent of the female workers in factories, to be in bed till 9, 10 or 11 o'clock on Sunday, because they were tired out by the labour of the week. Sunday was the only day on which they could rest their wearied frames. . . . It would generally be found that, the longer the time of work, the smaller the wages. . . . *He would rather be a slave in South Carolina, than a factory operative in England.*

At the great Ten-Hours' meeting at Burnley, Rev. E. A. Verity, incumbent of Habbergham Eaves, told his audience among other things:

Where was Mr. Cobden, where was Mr. Bright, where were the other members of the Manchester School, when the people of Lancashire were oppressed? . . . What was the end of the rich man's thinking? . . . Why, he was scheming how he could defraud the working classes out of an hour or two. That was the scheming of what he called the Manchester School. That made them such *cunning hypocrites*, and such *crafty rascals*. As a minister of the Church of England, he protested against such work.

The motive that has so suddenly metamorphosed the gentlemen of the Established Church into as many knights-errant of labor's rights, and so fervent knights too, has already been pointed out. They are not only laying in a stock of popularity for the rainy days of approaching democracy, they are not only conscious that the Established Church is essentially an aristocratic institution, which must either stand or fall with the landed oligarchy—there is something more. The men of the Manchester School are anti-State Church men, they are Dissenters, they are, above all, so highly enamored of the £13,000,000 annually abstracted from their pockets by the State Church in England and Wales alone that they are resolved to bring about a separation between those profane millions and the holy orders, the better to qualify the latter for heaven. The reverend gentlemen, therefore, are struggling *pro aris et focis*. The men of the Manchester School, however, may infer from this diversion that they will be unable to abstract the political power from the hands of the aristocracy unless they consent, with whatever reluctance, to give the people also their full share in it.

On the Continent, hanging, shooting, and transportation is the order of the day. But the executioners are themselves

tangible and hangable beings, and their deeds are recorded in the conscience of the whole civilized world. At the same time there acts in England an invisible, intangible, and silent despot, condemning individuals, in extreme cases, to the most cruel of deaths, and driving in its noiseless, everyday working, whole races and whole classes of men from the soil of their forefathers, like the angel with the fiery sword who drove Adam from Paradise. In the latter form the work of the unseen social despot calls itself *forced emigration*, in the former it is called *starvation*.

Some further cases of starvation have occurred in London during the present month. I remember only that of Mary Ann Sandry, aged forty-three years, who died in Coal-lane, Shadwell, London. Mr. Thomas Peene, the surgeon assisting the coroner's inquest, said the deceased died from starvation and exposure to the cold. The deceased was lying on a small heap of straw, without the slightest covering. The room was completely destitute of furniture, firing, and food. Five young children were sitting on the bare flooring, crying from hunger and cold by the side of the mother's dead body.

On the working of "forced emigration" in my next.

(Marx)

# **Forced Emigration—Kossuth and Mazzini—The Refugee Question— Election Bribery in England— Mr. Cobden**

---

*Written March 4, 1853 / Published March 22, 1853*

From the accounts relating to trade and navigation for the years 1851 and 1852, published in Feb. last, we see that the total declared value of *exports* amounted to £68,531,601 in 1851, and to £71,429,548 in 1852; of the latter amount, £47,209,000 go to the export of cotton, wool, linen, and silk manufactures. The quantity of *imports* for 1852 is below that for the year 1851. The proportion of imports entered for home consumption not having diminished, but rather increased, it follows that England has reexported, instead of the usual quantity of colonial produce, a certain amount of gold and silver.

The Colonial Land Emigration Office gives the following return of the emigration from England, Scotland, and Ire-



land, to all parts of the world, from Jan. 1, 1847, to Jan. 30, 1852:

| Year             | English | Scotch | Irish     | Total     |
|------------------|---------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| 1847 .....       | 34,685  | 8,616  | 214,969   | 258,270   |
| 1848 .....       | 58,865  | 11,505 | 177,719   | 248,089   |
| 1849 .....       | 73,613  | 17,127 | 208,758   | 299,498   |
| 1850 .....       | 57,843  | 15,154 | 207,852   | 280,849   |
| 1851 .....       | 69,557  | 18,646 | 247,763   | 335,966   |
| 1852 (till June) | 40,767  | 11,562 | 143,375   | 195,704   |
| Total .....      | 335,330 | 82,610 | 1,200,436 | 1,618,376 |

“Nine-tenths,” remarks the Office, “of the emigrants from Liverpool are assumed to be Irish. About three-fourths of the emigrants from Scotland are Celts, either from the Highlands, or from Ireland through Glasgow.”

Nearly four-fifths of the whole emigration are, accordingly, to be regarded as belonging to the Celtic population of Ireland and of the Highlands and islands of Scotland. The London *Economist* says of this emigration:

“It is consequent on the breaking down of the system of society founded on small holdings and potato cultivation”; and adds: “The departure of the redundant part of the population of Ireland and the Highlands of Scotland is an indispensable preliminary to every kind of improvement. . . . The revenue of Ireland has not suffered in any degree from the famine of 1846–47, or from the emigration that has since taken place. On the contrary, her net revenue amounted in 1851 to £4,281,999, being about £184,000 greater than in 1843.”

Begin with pauperizing the inhabitants of a country, and when there is no more profit to be ground out of them, when they have grown a burden to the revenue, drive them away, and sum up your Net Revenue! Such is the doctrine laid down by Ricardo, in his celebrated work, *The Principle of*

*Political Economy.* The annual profits of a capitalist amounting to £2,000, what does it matter to him whether he employs 100 men or 1,000 men? "Is not," says Ricardo, "the real income of a nation similar?" The net real income of a nation, rents and profits, remaining the same, it is no subject of consideration whether it is derived from ten millions of people or from twelve millions. Sismondi, in his *Nouveaux Principes d'Économie Politique*, answers that, according to this view of the matter, the English nation would not be interested at all in the disappearance of the whole population, the King (at that time it was no Queen, but a King) remaining alone in the midst of the island, supposing only that automatic machinery enabled him to procure the amount of *Net Revenue* now produced by a population of twenty millions. Indeed, that grammatical entity "the national wealth" would in this case not be diminished.

In a former letter I have given an instance of the clearing of estates in the Highlands of Scotland. That emigration continues to be forced upon Ireland by the same process you may see from the following quotation from *The Galway Mercury*:

The people are fast passing away from the land in the West of Ireland. The landlords of Connaught are tacitly combined to weed out all the smaller occupiers, against whom a regular systematic war of extermination is being waged. . . . The most heart-rending cruelties are daily practised in this province, of which the public are not at all aware.

But it is not only the pauperized inhabitants of Green Erin and of the Highlands of Scotland that are swept away by agricultural improvements, and by the "breaking down of the antiquated system of society." It is not only the able-bodied agricultural laborers from England, Wales, and Lower Scotland whose passages are paid by the Emigration Commissioners. The wheel of "improvement" is now seizing

another class, the most stationary class in England. A startling emigration movement has sprung up among the smaller English farmers, especially those holding heavy clay soils, who, with bad prospects for the coming harvest, and in want of sufficient capital to make the great improvements on their farms which would enable them to pay their old rents, have no other alternative but to cross the sea in search of a new country and of new lands. I am not speaking now of the emigration caused by the gold mania, but only of the compulsory emigration produced by landlordism, concentration of farms, application of machinery to the soil, and introduction of the modern system of agriculture on a great scale.

In the ancient states, in Greece and Rome, compulsory emigration, assuming the shape of the periodical establishment of colonies, formed a regular link in the structure of society. The whole system of those states was founded on certain limits to the numbers of the population, which could not be surpassed without endangering the condition of antique civilization itself. But why was it so? Because the application of science to material production was utterly unknown to them. To remain civilized they were forced to remain few. Otherwise they would have had to submit to the bodily drudgery which transformed the free citizen into a slave. The want of productive power made citizenship dependent on a certain proportion in numbers not to be disturbed. Forced emigration was the only remedy.

It was the same pressure of population on the powers of production that drove the barbarians from the high plains of Asia to invade the Old World. The same cause acted there, although under a different form. To remain barbarians they were forced to remain few. They were pastoral, hunting, war-waging tribes, whose manners of production required a large space for every individual, as is now the case with the Indian tribes in North America. By augmenting in numbers they curtailed each other's field of production. Thus the surplus population was forced to undertake those great adventurous

migratory movements which laid the foundation of the peoples of ancient and modern Europe.

But with modern compulsory emigration the case stands quite opposite. Here it is not the want of productive power which creates a surplus population; it is the increase of productive power which demands a diminution of population, and drives away the surplus by famine or emigration. It is not population that presses on productive power; it is productive power that presses on population.

Now I share neither in the opinions of Ricardo, who regards Net Revenue as the Moloch to whom entire populations must be sacrificed, without even so much as complaint, nor in the opinion of Sismondi, who, in his hypochondriacal philanthropy, would forcibly retain the superannuated methods of agriculture and proscribe science from industry, as Plato expelled poets from his Republic. Society is undergoing a silent revolution, which must be submitted to, and which takes no more notice of the human existences it breaks down than an earthquake regards the houses it subverts. The classes and the races, too weak to master the new conditions of life, must give way. But can there be anything more puerile, more shortsighted, than the views of those economists who believe in all earnest that this woeful transitory state means nothing but adapting society to the acquisitive propensities of capitalists, both landlords and money lords? In Great Britain the working of that process is most transparent. The application of modern science to production clears the land of its inhabitants, but it concentrates people in manufacturing towns.

"No manufacturing workmen," says *The Economist*, "have been assisted by the Emigration Commissioners, except a few Spitalfields and Paisley hand-loom weavers, and few or none have emigrated at their own expense."

*The Economist* knows very well that they could not emigrate at their own expense, and that the industrial middle class would not assist them in emigrating. Now, to what does

this lead? The rural population, the most stationary and conservative element of modern society, disappears, while the industrial proletariat, by the very working of modern production, finds itself gathered in mighty centers, around the great productive forces, whose history of creation has hitherto been the martyrology of the laborers. Who will prevent them from going a step further and appropriating these forces, to which they have been appropriated before? Where will be the power of resisting them? Nowhere! Then, it will be of no use to appeal to the "rights of property." The modern changes in the art of production have, according to the bourgeois economists themselves, broken down the antiquated system of society and its modes of appropriation. They have *expropriated* the Scotch clansman, the Irish cottier and tenant, the English yeoman, the hand-loom weaver, numberless handicrafts, whole generations of factory children and women; they will expropriate, in due time, the landlord and the cotton lord.

On the Continent heaven is fulminating, but in England the earth itself is trembling. England is the country where the real revulsion of modern society begins.

In my letter of the 1st inst. I told you that Mazzini would remonstrate publicly with Kossuth. On the 2d inst. there appeared actually in *The Morning Advertiser*, *Morning Post*, and *Daily News* a letter from Mazzini. As Mazzini himself has now broken the ice, I may as well state that Kossuth disowned his own document under the pressure of his Paris friends. In the past career of Kossuth we find many such symptoms of vacillating weakness, inextricable contradictions and duplicity. He possesses all the attractive virtues, but also all the feminine faults of the "artiste" character. He is a great artist *en paroles*. I recommend Mr. Szemere's lately published biographies of *Louis Bathiany*, *Arthur Görgey*, and *Louis Kossuth* to those who, unwilling to bow to popular

superstition, are anxious to form a matter-of-fact judgment.

As to Lombardy, you may be sure that, if Mazzini has failed to draw the Italian middle classes into the movement, Radetzky will not fail therein. At this moment he is preparing to confiscate the property of all emigrants, even those who emigrated with Austrian permission, and have been naturalized in other countries, *unless they prove they are unconnected with the late rising*. The Austrian papers calculate the amount of confiscable property at £12,000,000.

Upon a question put by Lord Dudley Stuart, Lord Palmerston stated in the session of the House of Commons of March 1:

That no application for the expulsion of the political refugees had been made by the Continental Powers, or that, if made, it would meet with a firm and decided refusal. *The British Government had never undertaken to provide for the internal security of other countries.*

That such an application, however, was intended to be made, you may see from the stockjobbing *Moniteur* and the *Journal des Débats*, which, in one of its last numbers, supposes England already bowing to the joint demands of Austria, Russia, Prussia, and France. That journal adds:

If the Swiss Confederation should refuse to allow Austria to exercise a *surveillance* over the Cantons on her frontiers she will probably violate the Swiss territory and occupy the Canton of Tessin; in which case France, to preserve a political equilibrium, would force her armies into the Swiss Cantons on her frontiers.

In substance, the *Journal des Débats* gives, with regard to Switzerland, that simple solution of the question jocosely

proposed by Prince Henry of Prussia to the Empress Catherine in 1770, with regard to Poland. In the meantime the venerable body called the German Diet is gravely discussing on "the application about to be made to England," and expends as much breath on this solemn matter as would suffice to swell the sails of the whole German fleet.

In the session of the House of Commons of the 1st inst., there occurred a very characteristic incident. The representatives of Bridgenorth and Blackburn having been declared unduly elected on the ground of bribery, Sir J. Shelley moved that the evidence taken before their respective committees should be laid upon the table of the House, and that the writs for reelection be suspended until the 4th of April. The Right Hon. Baronet Sir J. Trollope remarked with regard to this: "That 14 Committees had already been appointed to try boroughs for corrupt practices, and that about 50 more remained to be appointed," and he spoke of the difficulty in finding members enough in the House to constitute tribunals to judge the disputed elections, and at the same time to form committees for the ordinary business of the House. Sifting a little deeper into its own foundation, a breaking down of the House must ensue, and the parliamentary machinery come to a deadlock.

In his recent pamphlet, as well as in his *harangues* at the Manchester Peace Congress, and at various educational meetings, Mr. Cobden has amused himself with censuring the press. The whole press has retaliated upon him; but the most heavy blow strikes him from the hands of the "Englishman," whose letters on Louis Napoleon elicited such a sensation at the time of the *coup d'état*, and who has since turned round upon the silken barons and cotton lords. He concludes

a letter, addressed to Mr. Cobden, with the following epigrammatic characterization of the West-Riding oracle:

Elated and *unbalanced* by one single triumph, he would compass a popular autocracy. The prophet of a *clique*, restlessly agitating, greedy of notoriety, chafed of opposition, crotchety, illogical, utopian, stubborn of purpose, arrogant of bearing, a quarrelsome peace preacher, and acrimonious proselyte of universal brotherhood, with liberty upon his lips, but despotism in his dogmas, he is exasperated with a press that will neither be bullied nor bamboozled—would geld its influence, intelligence, and independence, and would sink a profession of accomplished gentlemen to a gang of penny-a-liners, with himself for the only LEADER.

(Marx)



# Revolution in China and in Europe

---

*Not Dated / Published June 14, 1853*

A most profound yet fantastic speculator on the principles which govern the movements of humanity<sup>1</sup> was wont to extol as one of the ruling secrets of nature what he called the law of the contact of extremes. The homely proverb that "extremes meet" was, in his view, a grand and potent truth in every sphere of life, an axiom with which the philosopher could as little dispense as the astronomer with the laws of Kepler or the great discovery of Newton.

Whether the "contact of extremes" be such a universal principle or not, a striking illustration of it may be seen in the effect the Chinese revolution<sup>2</sup> seems likely to exercise upon the civilized world. It may seem a very strange and a

<sup>1</sup> Hegel.

<sup>2</sup> The Taiping Rebellion, 1851-53.

very paradoxical assertion that the next uprising of the people of Europe, and their next movement for republican freedom and economy of government, may depend more probably on what is now passing in the Celestial Empire—the very opposite of Europe—than on any other political cause that now exists—more even than on the menaces of Russia and the consequent likelihood of a general European war. But yet it is no paradox, as all may understand by attentively considering the circumstances of the case.

Whatever be the social causes, and whatever religious, dynastic, or national shape they may assume, that have brought about the chronic rebellions subsisting in China for about ten years past, and now gathered together in one formidable revolution the occasion of this outbreak has unquestionably been afforded by the English cannon forcing upon China that soporific drug called opium.<sup>3</sup> Before the British arms the authority of the Manchu dynasty fell to pieces; the superstitious faith in the eternity of the Celestial Empire broke down; the barbarous and hermetic isolation from the civilized world was infringed; and an opening was made for that intercourse which has since proceeded so rapidly under the golden attractions of California and Australia. At the same time the silver coin of the Empire, its lifeblood, began to be drained away to the British East Indies.

Up to 1830, the balance of trade being continually in favor of the Chinese, there existed an uninterrupted importation of silver from India, Britain, and the United States into China. Since 1833, and especially since 1840, the export of silver from China to India has become almost exhausting for the Celestial Empire. Hence the strong decrees of the Emperor against the opium trade, responded to by still stronger resistance to his measures. Besides this immediate economical consequence, the bribery connected with opium smuggling has entirely demoralized the Chinese state officers in the southern provinces. Just as the Emperor was wont to be con-

<sup>3</sup> In the first Opium War, 1839–42.

sidered the father of all China, so his officers were looked upon as sustaining the paternal relation to their respective districts. But this patriarchal authority, the only moral link embracing the vast machinery of the state, has gradually been corroded by the corruption of those officers who have made great gains by conniving at opium smuggling. This has occurred principally in the same southern provinces where the rebellion commenced. It is almost needless to observe that, in the same measure in which opium has obtained the sovereignty over the Chinese, the Emperor and his staff of pedantic mandarins have become dispossessed of their own sovereignty. It would seem as though history had first to make this whole people drunk before it could rouse them out of their hereditary stupidity.

Though scarcely existing in former times, the import of English cottons, and to a small extent of English woollens, has rapidly risen since 1833, the epoch when the monopoly of trade with China was transferred from the East India Company to private commerce, and on a much greater scale since 1840, the epoch when other nations, and especially our own, also obtained a share in the Chinese trade. This introduction of foreign manufactures has had a similar effect on the native industry to that which it formerly had on Asia Minor, Persia, and India. In China the spinners and weavers have suffered greatly under this foreign competition, and the community has become unsettled in proportion.

The tribute to be paid to England after the unfortunate war of 1840, the great unproductive consumption of opium, the drain of the precious metals by this trade, the destructive influence of foreign competition on native manufactures, the demoralized condition of the public administration, produced two things: the old taxation became more burdensome and harassing, and new taxation was added to the old. Thus in a decree of the Emperor,<sup>4</sup> dated Peking, Jan. 5, 1853, we find orders given to the viceroys and governors of the south-

<sup>4</sup> The Emperor Hsien Feng.

ern provinces of Wuchang and Hanyang to remit and defer the payment of taxes, and especially not in any case to exact more than the regular amount; for otherwise, says the decree, "how will the poor people be able to bear it?" And "Thus, perhaps," continues the Emperor, "will my people, in a period of general hardship and distress, be exempted from the evils of being pursued and worried by the tax-gatherer." Such language as this, and such concessions we remember to have heard from Austria, the China of Germany, in 1848.

All these dissolving agencies acting together on the finances, the morals, the industry, and political structure of China, received their full development under the English cannon in 1840, which broke down the authority of the Emperor, and forced the Celestial Empire into contact with the terrestrial world. Complete isolation was the prime condition of the preservation of Old China. That isolation having come to a violent end by the medium of England, dissolution must follow as surely as that of any mummy carefully preserved in a hermetically sealed coffin whenever it is brought into contact with the open air. Now, England having brought about the revolution of China, the question is how that revolution will in time react on England, and through England on Europe. This question is not difficult of solution.

The attention of our readers has often been called to the unparalleled growth of British manufactures since 1850. Amid the most surprising prosperity, it has not been difficult to point out the clear symptoms of an approaching industrial crisis. Notwithstanding California and Australia,<sup>5</sup> notwithstanding the immense and unprecedented emigration, there must ever, without any particular accident, in due time arrive a moment when the extension of the markets is unable to keep pace with the extension of British manufactures, and this disproportion must bring about a new crisis with the same certainty as it has done in the past. But, if one of the

<sup>5</sup> Marx refers to the discovery of gold in California in 1848 and in Australia in 1851.

great markets suddenly becomes contracted, the arrival of the crisis is necessarily accelerated thereby. Now, the Chinese rebellion must, for the time being, have precisely this effect upon England. The necessity for opening new markets, or for extending the old ones, was one of the principal causes of the reduction of the British tea duties, as, with an increased importation of tea, an increased exportation of manufactures to China was expected to take place.<sup>6</sup> Now, the value of the annual exports from the United Kingdom to China amounted, before the repeal in 1834 of the trading monopoly possessed by the East India Company, to only £600,000; in 1836, it reached the sum of £1,326,388; in 1845, it had risen to £2,394,827; in 1852 it amounted to about £3,000,000. The quantity of tea imported from China did not exceed, in 1793, 16,167,331 lbs.; but in 1845 it amounted to 50,714,657 lbs.; in 1846, to 57,584,561 lbs.; it is now above 60,000,000 lbs.

The tea crop of the last season will not prove short, as shown already by the export lists from Shanghai, of 2,000,000 lbs. above the preceding year. This excess is to be accounted for by two circumstances. On one hand, the state of the market at the close of 1851 was much depressed, and the large surplus stock left has been thrown into the export of 1852. On the other hand, the recent accounts of the altered British legislation with regard to imports of tea reaching China have brought forward all the available teas to a ready market, at greatly enhanced prices. But with respect to the coming crop the case stands very differently. This is shown by the following extracts from the correspondence of a large tea firm in London:

In Shanghai the terror is extreme. Gold has advanced in value upwards of 25 per cent., *being eagerly sought for hoarding*; silver has so far disappeared that *none could be obtained*

<sup>6</sup> Gladstone's 1853 budget cut the duty on tea more than 50 per cent over three years.

to pay the Chinese dues on the British vessels requiring port clearance; and in consequence of which Mr. Alcock has consented to become responsible to the Chinese authorities for the payment of these dues, on receipt of East India Company's bills, or other approved securities. *The scarcity of the precious metals* is one of the most unfavourable features, when viewed in reference to the immediate future of commerce, as this abstraction occurs precisely at that period when their use is most needed, to enable the tea and silk buyers to go into the interior and effect their purchases, for which a *large portion of bullion is paid in advance, to enable the producers to carry on their operations*. . . . At this period of the year it is usual to begin making arrangements for the new teas, whereas at present nothing is talked of but the means of protecting person and property, all transactions being at a stand. . . . if the means are not applied to secure the leaves in April and May, the early crop, which includes all the finer descriptions, both of black and green teas, will be as much lost as unreaped wheat at Christmas.<sup>7</sup>

Now the means for securing the tea leaves will certainly not be given by the English, American, or French squadrons stationed in the Chinese seas, but these may easily, by their interference, produce such complications as to cut off all transactions between the tea-producing interior and the tea-exporting seaports. Thus, for the present crop, a rise in the prices must be expected—speculation has already commenced in London—and for the crop to come a large deficit is as good as certain. Nor is this all. The Chinese, ready though they may be, as are all people in periods of revolutionary convulsion, to sell off to the foreigner all the bulky commodities they have on hand, will, as the Orientals are used to do in the apprehension of great changes, set to hoarding, not taking much in return for their tea and silk except hard money. England has accordingly to expect a rise in the price of one of her chief articles of consumption, a drain of

<sup>7</sup> Quoted from *The Economist*, May 21, 1853. The italics are Marx's. Much of this article is based on *The Economist* of April 30, May 14, and May 21.

bullion, and a great contraction of an important market for her cotton and woollen goods. Even *The Economist*, that optimist conjurer of all things menacing the tranquil minds of the mercantile community, is compelled to use language like this:

We must not flatter ourselves with finding as extensive a market as formerly for our exports to China as hitherto . . . It is more probable that our export trade to China should suffer, and that there should be a diminished demand for the produce of Manchester and Glasgow.<sup>8</sup>

It must not be forgotten that the rise in the price of so indispensable an article as tea, and the contraction of so important a market as China, will coincide with a deficient harvest in Western Europe, and, therefore, with rising prices of meat, corn, and all other agricultural produce. Hence contracted markets for manufacturers, because every rise in the prices of the first necessities of life is counterbalanced, at home and abroad, by a corresponding reduction in the demand for manufactures. From every part of Great Britain complaints have been received on the backward state of most of the crops. *The Economist* says on this subject:

In the South of England not only will there be left much land unsown until too late for a crop of any sort, but much of the sown land will prove to be foul, or otherwise in a bad state for corn-growing. On the wet or poor soils destined for wheat, signs that mischief is going on are apparent. The time for planting mangel-wurzel may now be said to have passed away, and very little has been planted, while the time for preparing land for the turnip is rapidly going by, without any adequate preparation for this important crop having been accomplished. . . . Oat-sowing has been much interfered with by the snow and rain. Few oats were sown early, and late-sown oats seldom

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

produce a large crop. . . . In many districts losses among the breeding flocks have been considerable.

The price of other farm produce than corn is from 20 to 30, and even 50 per cent higher than last year. On the Continent, corn has risen comparatively more than in England. Rye has risen in Belgium and Holland a full 100 per cent. Wheat and other grains are following suit.

Under these circumstances, as the greater part of the regular commercial circle has already been run through by British trade, it may safely be augured that the Chinese revolution will throw the spark into the overloaded mine of the present industrial system and cause the explosion of the long-prepared general crisis, which, spreading abroad, will be closely followed by political revolutions on the Continent. It would be a curious spectacle, that of China sending disorder into the Western world while the Western powers, by English, French and American war steamers, are conveying "order" to Shanghai, Nanking, and the mouths of the Great Canal. Do these order-mongering powers, which would attempt to support the wavering Manchu dynasty, forget that the hatred against foreigners and their exclusion from the Empire, once the mere result of China's geographical and ethnographical situation, have become a political system only since the conquest of the country by the race of the Manchu Tatars? There can be no doubt that the turbulent dissensions among the European nations who, at the later end of the seventeenth century, rivaled each other in the trade with China, lent a mighty aid to the exclusive policy adopted by the Manchus. But more than this was done by the fear of the new dynasty, lest the foreigners might favor the discontent existing among a large proportion of the Chinese during the first half-century or thereabouts of their subjection to the Tatars. From these considerations, foreigners were then prohibited from all communication with the Chinese, except through Canton, a town at a great distance from



Peking and the tea districts, and their commerce restricted to intercourse with the Hong merchants,<sup>9</sup> licensed by the government expressly for the foreign trade, in order to keep the rest of its subjects from all connection with the odious strangers. In any case an interference on the part of the Western governments at this time can only serve to render the revolution more violent, and protract the stagnation of trade.

At the same time it is to be observed with regard to India that the British government of that country depends for full one seventh of its revenue on the sale of opium to the Chinese, while a considerable proportion of the Indian demand for British manufactures depends on the production of that opium in India. The Chinese, it is true, are no more likely to renounce the use of opium than are the Germans to forswear tobacco. But as the new Emperor is understood to be favorable to the culture of the poppy and the preparation of opium in China itself, it is evident that a deathblow is very likely to be struck at once at the business of opium raising in India, the Indian revenue, and the commercial resources of Hindustan. Though this blow would not immediately be felt by the interests concerned, it would operate effectually in due time, and would come in to intensify and prolong the universal financial crisis whose horoscope we have cast above.

Since the commencement of the eighteenth century there has been no serious revolution in Europe which had not been preceded by a commercial and financial crisis. This applies no less to the revolution of 1789 than to that of 1848. It is true, not only that we every day behold more threatening symptoms of conflict between the ruling powers and their subjects, between the state and society, between the various classes; but also the conflict of the existing powers among each other gradually reaching that height where the sword must be drawn, and the *ultima ratio* of princes be resorted to. In the European capitals, every day brings dispatches big

<sup>9</sup> "Hong" can be roughly translated as "guild."

with universal war, vanishing under the dispatches of the following day, bearing the assurance of peace for a week or so. We may be sure, nevertheless, that to whatever height the conflict between the European powers may rise, however threatening the aspect of the diplomatic horizon may appear, whatever movements may be attempted by some enthusiastic fraction in this or that country, the rage of princes and the fury on the people are alike enervated by the breath of prosperity. Neither wars nor revolutions are likely to put Europe by the ears, unless in consequence of a general commercial and industrial crisis, the signal of which has, as usual, to be given by England, the representative of European industry in the market of the world.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the political consequences such a crisis must produce in these times, with the unprecedented extension of factories in England, with the utter dissolution of her official parties, with the whole state machinery of France transformed into one immense swindling and stockjobbing concern, with Austria on the eve of bankruptcy, with wrongs everywhere accumulated to be revenged by the people, with the conflicting interests of the reactionary powers themselves, and with the Russian dream of conquest once more revealed to the world.

(Marx)

# **The British Rule in India**

---

*Dated June 10, 1853 / Published June 25, 1853*

Telegraphic dispatches from Vienna announce that the pacific solution of the Turkish, Sardinian and Swiss question is regarded there as a certainty.

Last night the debate on India was continued in the House of Commons, in the usual dull manner. Mr. Blackett charged the statements of Sir Charles Wood and Sir J. Hogg with bearing the stamp of optimist falsehood. A lot of ministerial and directorial<sup>1</sup> advocates rebuked the charge as well as they could, and the inevitable Mr. Hume summed up by calling on ministers to withdraw their bill. Debate adjourned.

Hindustan is an Italy of Asiatic dimensions, the Himalayas for the Alps, the Plains of Bengal for the Plains of Lombardy,

<sup>1</sup> The Court of Directors was the governing body of the East India Company.

the Deccan for the Appenines, and the Isle of Ceylon for the Island of Sicily. The same rich variety in the products of the soil, and the same dismemberment in the political configuration. Just as Italy has, from time to time, been compressed by the conqueror's sword into different national masses, so do we find Hindustan, when not under the pressure of the Mohammedan, or the Mogul, or the Briton, dissolved into as many independent and conflicting states as it numbered towns, or even villages. Yet, in a social point of view, Hindustan is not the Italy, but the Ireland of the East. And this strange combination of Italy and of Ireland, of a world of voluptuousness and of a world of woes, is anticipated in the ancient traditions of the religion of Hindustan. That religion is at once a religion of sensualist exuberance, and a religion of self-torturing asceticism; a religion of the lingam, and of the Juggernaut; the religion of the monk, and of the bayadere.

I share not the opinion of those who believe in a golden age of Hindustan, without recurring, however, like Sir Charles Wood, for the confirmation of my view, to the authority of Kuli Khan.<sup>2</sup> But take, for example, the times of Aurangzeb; or the epoch when the Mogul appeared in the north and the Portuguese in the south; or the age of Mohammedan invasion, and of the Heptarchy<sup>3</sup> in southern India; or, if you will, go still more back to antiquity, take the mythological chronology of the Brahman himself, who places the commencement of Indian misery in an epoch even more remote than the Christian creation of the world.

There cannot, however, remain any doubt but that the misery inflicted by the British on Hindustan is of an essentially different and infinitely more intensive kind than all

<sup>2</sup> Sir Charles Wood, President of the Board of Control, claimed that India was prospering and favorably compared the present situation in Delhi with the time when it had been destroyed by Nadir Shah (Kuli Khan), the Persian conqueror, in 1793.

<sup>3</sup> Heptarchy—the feudal dismemberment of the Deccan before its conquest by the Muslims.

Hindustan had to suffer before. I do not allude to European despotism, planted upon Asiatic despotism by the British East India Company, forming a more monstrous combination than any of the divine monsters startling us in the Temple of Salsette. This is no distinctive feature of British colonial rule, but only an imitation of the Dutch, and so much so that in order to characterize the working of the British East India Company it is sufficient to literally repeat what Sir Stamford Raffles, the *English* Governor of Java, said of the old Dutch East India Company.

The Dutch Company, actuated solely by the spirit of gain, and viewing their subjects with less regard or consideration than a West India planter formerly viewed a gang upon his estate, because the latter had paid the purchase money of human property, which the other had not, employed all the existing machinery of despotism to squeeze from the people their utmost mite of contribution, the last dregs of their labour, and thus aggravated the evils of a capricious and semi-barbarous Government, by working it with all the practised ingenuity of politicians, and all the monopolizing selfishness of traders.

All the civil wars, invasions, revolutions, conquests, famines, strangely complex, rapid, and destructive as the successive action in Hindustan may appear, did not go deeper than its surface. England has broken down the entire framework of Indian society, without any symptoms of reconstitution yet appearing. This loss of his old world, with no gain of a new one, imparts a particular kind of melancholy to the present misery of the Hindu, and separates Hindustan, ruled by Britain, from all its ancient traditions, and from the whole of its past history.

There have been in Asia, generally, from immemorial times, but three departments of government: that of Finance, or the plunder of the interior; that of War, or the plunder of the exterior; and, finally, the department of Public Works. Climate and territorial conditions, especially the vast

tracts of desert extending from the Sahara through Arabia, Persia, India and Tartary, to the most elevated Asiatic highlands, constituted artificial irrigation by canals and waterworks the basis of Oriental agriculture. As in Egypt and India, inundations are used for fertilizing the soil in Mesopotamia, Persia, etc.; advantage is taken of a high level for feeding irrigative canals. This prime necessity of an economical and common use of water, which, in the Occident, drove private enterprise to voluntary association, as in Flanders and Italy, necessitated in the Orient, where civilization was too low and the territorial extent too vast to call into life voluntary association, the interference of the centralizing power of government. Hence an economical function devolved upon all Asiatic governments, the function of providing public works. This artificial fertilization of the soil, dependent on a central government, and immediately decaying with the neglect of irrigation and drainage, explains the otherwise strange fact that we now find whole territories barren and desert that were once brilliantly cultivated, as Palmyra, Petra, the ruins in Yemen, and large provinces of Egypt, Persia, and Hindustan; it also explains how a single war of devastation has been able to depopulate a country for centuries, and to strip it of all its civilization.

Now, the British in East India accepted from their predecessors the departments of finance and of war, but they have neglected entirely that of public works. Hence the deterioration of an agriculture which is not capable of being conducted on the British principle of free competition, of *laissez faire* and *laissez aller*. But in Asiatic empires we are quite accustomed to see agriculture deteriorating under one government and reviving again under some other government. There the harvests correspond to good or bad governments, as they change in Europe with good or bad seasons. Thus the oppression and neglect of agriculture, bad as it is, could not be looked upon as the final blow dealt to Indian society by the British intruder, had it not been attended by a circum-

stance of quite different importance, a novelty in the annals of the whole Asiatic world. However changing the political aspect of India's past must appear, its social condition has remained unaltered since its remotest antiquity, until the first decennium of the nineteenth century. The hand loom and the spinning wheel, producing their regular myriads of spinners and weavers, were the pivots of the structure of that society. From immemorial times, Europe received the admirable textures of Indian labor, sending in return for them her precious metals, and furnishing thereby his material to the goldsmith, that indispensable member of Indian society, whose love of finery is so great that even the lowest class, those who go about nearly naked, have commonly a pair of golden earrings and a gold ornament of some kind hung round their necks. Rings on the fingers and toes have also been common. Women as well as children frequently wore massive bracelets and anklets of gold or silver, and statuettes of divinities in gold and silver were met with in the households. It was the British intruder who broke up the Indian hand loom and destroyed the spinning wheel. England began with driving the Indian cottons from the European market; it then introduced twist into Hindustan and in the end inundated the very mother country of cotton with cottons. From 1818 to 1836 the export of twist from Great Britain to India rose in the proportion of 1 to 5,200. In 1824 the export of British muslins to India hardly amounted to 1,000,000 yards, while in 1837 it surpassed 64,000,000 of yards. But at the same time the population of Dacca decreased from 150,000 inhabitants to 20,000. This decline of Indian towns celebrated for their fabrics was by no means the worst consequence. British steam and science uprooted, over the whole surface of Hindustan, the union between agriculture and manufacturing industry.

These two circumstances—the Hindu, on the one hand, leaving, like all Oriental peoples, to the central government the care of the great public works, the prime condition of

his agriculture and commerce, dispersed, on the other hand, over the surface of the country, and agglomerated in small centers by the domestic union of agricultural and manufacturing pursuits—these two circumstances had brought about, since the remotest times, a social system of particular features—the so-called *village system*, which gave to each of these small unions their independent organization and distinct life. The peculiar character of this system may be judged from the following description, contained in an old official report of the British House of Commons on Indian affairs:

A village, geographically considered, is a tract of country comprising some hundred or thousand acres of arable and waste lands; politically viewed it resembles a corporation or township. Its proper establishment of officers and servants consists of the following descriptions: The *potail*, or head inhabitant, who has generally the superintendence of the affairs of the village, settles the disputes of the inhabitants, attends to the police, and performs the duty of collecting the revenue within his village, a duty which his personal influence and minute acquaintance with the situation and concerns of the people render him the best qualified for this charge. The *kurnum* keeps the accounts of cultivation, and registers everything connected with it. The *tallier* and the *totie*, the duty of the former of which consists in gaining information of crimes and offences, and in escorting and protecting persons travelling from one village to another; the province of the latter appearing to be more immediately confined to the village, consisting, among other duties, in guarding the crops and assisting in measuring them. The *boundaryman*, who preserves the limits of the village, or gives evidence respecting them in cases of dispute. The superintendent of tanks and watercourses distributes the water for the purposes of agriculture. The Brahmin, who performs the village worship. The schoolmaster, who is seen teaching the children in a village to read and write in the sand. The calendar-Brahmin, or astrologer, etc. These officers and servants generally constitute the establishment of a village; but in some



parts of the country it is of less extent; some of the duties and functions above described being united in the same person; in others it exceeds the above-named number of individuals. Under this simple form of municipal government, the inhabitants of the country have lived from time immemorial. The boundaries of the villages have been but seldom altered; and though the villages themselves have been sometimes injured, and even desolated, by war, famine or disease, the same name, the same limits, the same interests, and even the same families, have continued for ages. The inhabitants gave themselves no trouble about the breaking up and divisions of kingdoms; while the village remains entire, they care not to what power it is transferred, or to what sovereign it devolves; its internal economy remains unchanged. The potail is still the head inhabitant, and still acts as the petty judge or magistrate, and collector or rentor of the village.<sup>4</sup>

These small stereotype forms of social organism have been to the greater part dissolved, and are disappearing, not so much through the brutal interference of the British tax-gatherer and the British soldier, as to the working of English steam and English free trade. Those family communities were based on domestic industry, in that peculiar combination of hand weaving, hand spinning, and hand tilling agriculture which gave them self-supporting power. English interference having placed the spinner in Lancashire and the weaver in Bengal, or sweeping away both Hindu spinner and weaver, dissolved these small semibarbarian, semicivilized communities by blowing up their economical basis, and thus produced the greatest, and, to speak the truth, the only, *social* revolution ever heard of in Asia.

Now, sickening as it must be to human feeling to witness those myriads of industrious patriarchal and inoffensive social organizations disorganized and dissolved into their units, thrown into a sea of woes, and their individual members los-

<sup>4</sup> The House of Commons *Report* was published in 1812. Marx quotes from a German text.

ing at the same time their ancient form of civilization and their hereditary means of subsistence, we must not forget that these idyllic village communities, inoffensive though they may appear, had always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies. We must not forget the barbarian egotism which, concentrating on some miserable patch of land, had quietly witnessed the ruin of empires, the perpetration of unspeakable cruelties, the massacre of the population of large towns, with no other consideration bestowed upon them than on natural events, itself the helpless prey of any aggressor who deigned to notice it at all. We must not forget that this undignified, stagnatory, and vegetative life, that this passive sort of existence evoked on the other part, in contradistinction, wild, aimless, unbounded forces of destruction, and rendered murder itself a religious rite in Hindustan. We must not forget that these little communities were contaminated by distinctions of caste and by slavery, that they subjugated man to external circumstances instead of elevating man to be the sovereign of circumstances, that they transformed a self-developing social state into never-changing natural destiny, and thus brought about a brutalizing worship of nature, exhibiting its degradation in the fact that man, the sovereign of nature, fell down on his knees in adoration of Hanuman, the monkey, and Sabala, the cow.

England, it is true, in causing a social revolution in Hindustan, was actuated only by the vilest interests, and was stupid in her manner of enforcing them. But that is not the question. The question is, can mankind fulfill its destiny without a fundamental revolution in the social state of Asia? If not, whatever may have been the crimes of England she was the unconscious tool of history in bringing about that revolution.

Then, whatever bitterness the spectacle of the crumbling of an ancient world may have for our personal feelings, we have the right, in point of history, to exclaim with Goethe:

*Sollte diese Qual uns quälen,  
Da sie unser Lust vermehrt,  
Hat nicht Myriaden Seelen  
Timurs Herrschaft aufgezehrt?*

Should this torture then torment us  
Since it brings us greater pleasure?  
Were not through the rule of Timur  
Souls devoured without measure?

Goethe, *An Suleika*

(Marx)

# **The Future Results of the British Rule in India**

---

*Dated July 22, 1853 / Published August 8, 1853*

I propose in this letter to conclude my observations on India.

How came it that English supremacy was established in India? The paramount power of the Great Mogul was broken by the Mogul viceroys. The power of the viceroys was broken by the Mahrattas.<sup>1</sup> The power of the Mahrattas was broken by the Afghans, and while all were struggling against all, the Briton rushed in and was enabled to subdue them all. A country not only divided between Mohammedan and Hindu, but between tribe and tribe, between caste and caste; a society whose framework was based on a sort of equilib-

<sup>1</sup> The Mahrattas (Mahrathas) overthrew the Mogul empire in the mid-seventeenth century. They then fell prey to internal divisions and were overthrown by the forces of the East India Company in the Mahratta War of 1803-05.

rium, resulting from a general repulsion and constitutional exclusiveness between all its members. Such a country and such a society, were they not the predestined prey of conquest? If we knew nothing of the past history of Hindustan, would there not be the one great and incontestable fact, that even at this moment India is held in English thralldom by an Indian army maintained at the cost of India? India, then, could not escape the fate of being conquered, and the whole of her past history, if it be anything, is the history of the successive conquests she has undergone. Indian society has no history at all, at least no known history. What we call its history is but the history of the successive intruders who founded their empires on the passive basis of that unresisting and unchanging society. The question, therefore, is not whether the English had a right to conquer India, but whether we are to prefer India conquered by the Turk, by the Persian, by the Russian, to India conquered by the Briton.

England has to fulfill a double mission in India, one destructive, the other regenerating: the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and the laying of the material foundations of Western society in Asia.

Arabs, Turks, Tatars, Moguls, who had successively overrun India, soon became *Hinduized*, the barbarian conquerors being, by an eternal law of history, conquered themselves by the superior civilization of their subjects. The British were the first conquerors superior, and, therefore, inaccessible to Hindu civilization. They destroyed it by breaking up the native communities, by uprooting the native industry, and by leveling all that was great and elevated in the native society. The historic pages of their rule in India report hardly anything beyond that destruction. The work of regeneration hardly transpires through a heap of ruins. Nevertheless it has begun.

The political unity of India, more consolidated and extending farther than it ever did under the Great Moguls, was

the first condition of its regeneration. That unity, imposed by the British sword, will now be strengthened and perpetuated by the electric telegraph. The native army, organized and trained by the British drill sergeant, was the *sine qua non* of Indian self-emancipation, and of India ceasing to be the prey of the first foreign intruder. The free press, introduced for the first time into Asiatic society, and managed principally by the common offspring of Hindus and Europeans, is a new and powerful agent of reconstruction. The zemindari and ryotwari<sup>2</sup> themselves, abominable as they are, involve two distinct forms of private property in land—the great desideratum of Asiatic society. From the Indian natives, reluctantly and sparingly educated at Calcutta under English superintendence, a fresh class is springing up, endowed with the requirements for government and imbued with European science. Steam has brought India into regular and rapid communication with Europe, has connected its chief ports with those of the whole southeastern ocean, and has revindicated it from the isolated position which was the prime law of its stagnation. The day is not far distant when, by a combination of railways and steam vessels, the distance between England and India, measured by time, will be shortened to eight days, and when that once fabulous country will thus be actually annexed to the Western world.

The ruling classes of Great Britain have had, till now, but an accidental, transitory, and exceptional interest in the progress of India. The aristocracy wanted to conquer it, the moneyocracy to plunder it, and the millocracy to undersell it. But now the tables are turned. The millocracy have discovered that the transformation of India into a reproductive country has become of vital importance to them, and that, to that end, it is necessary, above all, to gift her with means of irrigation and of internal communication. They intend now

<sup>2</sup> Roughly speaking, the zemindars were landowners and the ryots were their tenants; actually, through a complex legal fiction, the ryots were treated as though they held their land from the government.

drawing a net of railroads over India. And they will do it. The results must be inappreciable.

It is notorious that the productive powers of India are paralyzed by the utter want of means for conveying and exchanging its various produce. Nowhere more than in India do we meet with social destitution in the midst of natural plenty, for want of the means of exchange. It was proved before a Committee of the British House of Commons, which sat in 1848, that

when grain was selling from 6s. to 8s. a quarter at Khandesh, it was sold at 64s. to 70s. at Poona, where the people were dying in the streets of famine, without the possibility of gaining supplies from Khandesh, because the clay roads were impracticable.

The introduction of railroads may be easily made to subserve agricultural purposes by the formation of tanks, where ground is required for embankment, and by the conveyance of water along the different lines. Thus irrigation, the *sine qua non* of farming in the East, might be greatly extended, and the frequently recurring local famines, arising from the want of water, would be averted. The general importance of railways, viewed under this head, must become evident, when we remember that irrigated lands, even in the districts near ghats, pay three times as much in taxes, afford ten or twelve times as much employment, and yield twelve or fifteen times as much profit, as the same area without irrigation.

Railways will afford the means of diminishing the amount and the cost of the military establishments. Col. Warren, Town Major of the Fort St. William, stated before a Select Committee of the House of Commons:

The practicability of receiving intelligence from distant parts of the country in as many hours as at present it requires days and even weeks, and of sending instructions with troops and

stores, in the more brief period, are considerations which cannot be too highly estimated. Troops could be kept at more distant and healthier stations than at present, and much loss of life from sickness would by this means be spared. Stores could not to the same extent be required at the various depots, and the loss by decay, and the destruction incidental to the climate, would also be avoided. The number of troops might be diminished in direct proportion to their effectiveness.

We know that the municipal organization and the economical basis of the village communities have been broken up, but their worst feature, the dissolution of society into stereotype and disconnected atoms, has survived their vitality. The village isolation produced the absence of roads in India, and the absence of roads perpetuated the village isolation. On this plan a community existed with a given scale of low conveniences, almost without intercourse with other villages, without the desires and efforts indispensable to social advance. The British having broken up this self-sufficient *inertia* of the villages, railways will provide the new want of communication and intercourse. Besides,

one of the effects of the railway system will be to bring into every village affected by it such knowledge of the contrivances and appliances of other countries, and such means of obtaining them, as will first put the hereditary and stipendiary village artisanship of India to full proof of its capabilities, and then supply its defects. (Chapman, *The Cotton and Commerce of India*.)<sup>3</sup>

I know that the English millocracy intend to endow India with railways with the exclusive view of extracting at diminished expenses the cotton and other raw materials for their manufactures. But when you have once introduced machinery into the locomotion of a country which possesses iron and coals, you are unable to withhold it from its fabrication.

<sup>3</sup> Published in 1851.



You cannot maintain a net of railways over an immense country without introducing all those industrial processes necessary to meet the immediate and current wants of railway locomotion, and out of which there must grow the application of machinery to those branches of industry not immediately connected with railways. The railway system will therefore become, in India, truly the forerunner of modern industry. This is the more certain as the Hindus are allowed by British authorities themselves to possess particular aptitude for accommodating themselves to entirely new labor, and acquiring the requisite knowledge of machinery. Ample proof of this fact is afforded by the capacities and expertness of the native engineers in the Calcutta mint, where they have been for years employed in working the steam machinery, by the natives attached to the several steam engines in the Hardwar coal districts, and by other instances. Mr. Campbell himself, greatly influenced as he is by the prejudices of the East India Company, is obliged to avow "that the great mass of the Indian people possesses a great *industrial energy*, is well fitted to accumulate capital, and remarkable for a mathematical clearness of head, and talent for figures and exact sciences." "Their intellects," he says, "are excellent."<sup>4</sup> Modern industry, resulting from the railway system, will dissolve the hereditary divisions of labor, upon which rest the Indian castes, those decisive impediments to Indian progress and Indian power.

All the English bourgeoisie may be forced to do will neither emancipate nor materially mend the social condition of the mass of the people, depending not only on the development of the productive powers, but of their appropriation by the people. But what they will not fail to do is to lay down the material premises for both. Has the bourgeoisie ever done more? Has it ever effected a progress without dragging individuals and peoples through blood and dirt, through misery and degradation?

<sup>4</sup> G. Campbell, *Modern India*, London (1852).

The Indians will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society scattered among them by the British bourgeoisie till in Great Britain itself the now ruling classes shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Hindus themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether. At all events, we may safely expect to see, at a more or less remote period, the regeneration of that great and interesting country, whose gentle natives are, to use the expression of Prince Saltykov, even in the most inferior classes, "*plus fins et plus adroits que les Italiens*," whose submission even is counterbalanced by a certain calm nobility, who, notwithstanding their natural languor, have astonished the British officers by their bravery, whose country has been the source of our languages, our religions, and who represent the type of the ancient German in the Jat and the type of the ancient Greek in the Brahman.

I cannot part with the subject of India without some concluding remarks.

The profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization lies unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home, where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies, where it goes naked. They are the defenders of property, but did any revolutionary party ever originate agrarian revolutions like those in Bengal, in Madras, and in Bombay? Did they not, in India, to borrow an expression of that great robber, Lord Clive himself, resort to atrocious extortion, when simple corruption could not keep pace with their rapacity? While they prated in Europe about the inviolable sanctity of the national debt, did they not confiscate in India the dividends of the rajahs, who had invested their private savings in the Company's own funds? While they combated the French Revolution under the pretext of defending "our holy religion," did they not forbid, at the same time, Christianity to be propagated in India, and did they not, in order to make money out of the pilgrims streaming to the temples of Orissa and Bengal, take up the trade in the murder and prostitution

perpetrated in the temple of Juggernaut? These are the men of "Property, Order, Family, and Religion."

The devastating effects of English industry, when contemplated with regard to India, a country as vast as Europe, and containing 150 millions of acres, are palpable and confounding. But we must not forget that they are only the organic results of the whole system of production as it is now constituted. That production rests on the supreme rule of capital. The centralization of capital is essential to the existence of capital as an independent power. The destructive influence of that centralization upon the markets of the world does but reveal, in the most gigantic dimensions, the inherent organic laws of political economy now at work in every civilized town. The bourgeois period of history has to create the material basis of the new world—on the one hand the universal intercourse founded upon the mutual dependency of mankind, and the means of that intercourse; on the other hand the development of the productive powers of man and the transformation of material production into a scientific domination of natural agencies. Bourgeois industry and commerce create these material conditions of a new world in the same way as geological revolutions have created the surface of the earth. When a great social revolution shall have mastered the results of the bourgeois epoch, the market of the world and the modern powers of production, and subjected them to the common control of the most advanced peoples, then only will human progress cease to resemble that hideous pagan idol who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain.

(Marx)

## Palmerston

---

*Dated October 4, 1853 / Published October 19, 1853*

The Eastern complications have worked a great change in England, if not as to parties, at least as to the men at the head of parties. Lord Palmerston has again become a popular favorite. He is in everybody's mouth, he is the only man to save England, he is confidently announced as the indispensable Premier of any modified cabinet, extolled alike by the Tories, the Whigs, the self-styled patriots, the press, and public opinion in general.

So extraordinary a phenomenon is the Palmerston mania that one is tempted to suppose it to be of a merely fictitious character, got up not for home consumption, but as an article of export, destined for foreign use. This, however, would be a mistake. Rinaldo is again and again fascinated by the false

charms of Alcide,<sup>1</sup> which, as he knows, disguise an old witch, "sans eyes, sans teeth, sans taste, sans everything," and the knight-errant cannot withstand falling in love with her anew, whom he knows to have transmuted all her former adorers into asses and other beasts. The English public is another Rinaldo and Palmerston another Alcide. Although a septuagenarian, who, since 1807, has occupied the public stage almost without interruption, he continues to remain a novelty, and to evoke all the hopes that used to center upon untried and promising youth. With one foot in the grave, he is supposed not to have begun his true career. If he were to die tomorrow all England would be surprised to learn that he had been a Secretary of State for half a century.

If not a good statesman of all work he is a good actor of all work. He succeeds in the comic as in the heroic, in pathos as in familiarity, in tragedy as in farce, although the latter may be more congenial to his feelings. He is not a first-class orator, but an accomplished debater. Possessed of a wonderful memory, of great experience, of consummate tact, of never-failing presence of mind, of gentlemanlike variety of talent, of the most minute knowledge of parliamentary tricks, intrigues, parties and men, he handles difficult cases in an admirable manner, and with a pleasant volatility, sticking to the prejudices and the susceptibilities of his audience, secured from any surprise by his cynic impudence, from any self-confession by his selfish dexterity, and from running into a passion by his profound frivolity, his perfect indifference, and his aristocratic contempt. Being an exceedingly happy joker, he ingratiates himself with everybody. Never losing his temper, he imposes on passionate antagonists. If unable to master a subject, he knows how to play with it. If wanting general views, he is always ready to weave a web of elegant generalities.

Endowed with a restless and indefatigable spirit, he abhors inactivity and pines for agitation, if not for action. A

<sup>1</sup> Rinaldo and Alcide are characters in Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*.

country like England allows him, of course, to busy himself in every corner of the earth. If he can do nothing, he will devise anything. Where he dares not interfere, he intermeddles. When unable to vie with a strong enemy he extemporizes a weak one. What he aims at is not the substance, but the mere appearance of success. Being no man of deep designs, pondering on no combinations of long standing, pursuing no great object, he embarks in difficulties with a view to disentangle himself from them in a showy manner. He wants complications to feed his activity, and when he finds them not ready, he will create them. He exults in show-conflicts, show-battles, show-enemies, diplomatic notes to be exchanged, ships to be ordered to sail, all ending in violent parliamentary debates, which are sure to prepare for him an ephemeral success—the constant and exclusive object of all his exertions.<sup>2</sup> He manages international conflicts like an artist, driving matters to a certain point, retreating when they threaten to become serious, but having got, at all events, the dramatic excitement he desires. The history of the world is, in his eyes, a pastime, expressly invented for the noble Viscount Palmerston of Palmerston. He is a great sample of that species designated by Thomas Carlyle as the sham captains of the world.

Yielding to foreign influence in fact, he opposes it in words. Having inherited from Canning England's mission of propagating constitutionalism on the Continent, he never lacks a theme to pique the national prejudices, so as to coun-

<sup>2</sup> In the German version of this article, published in the *Neue Oder Zeitung* (February 19, 1855), Marx changed this sentence to read: "No British Foreign Secretary ever displayed such activity in every corner of the earth: blockades of the Scheldt, the Tagus, the Douro; blockades of Mexico and Buenos Aires; Naples expeditions, Pacific expeditions, expeditions to the Persian Gulf, wars in Spain to establish 'liberty' and in China to introduce opium; North American border disputes, Afghanistan campaigns, St. Jean d'Acre bombardment, West African right-of-search wrangles, strife even in the 'Pacific'; and all this accompanied and supplemented by a host of threatening notes and sheaves of protocols and diplomatic protests. As a rule all this noise ends in violent parliamentary debates which assure the noble lord ever so many an ephemeral triumph."

teract revolution abroad, and at the same time to keep awake the suspicious jealousy of foreign powers. Having succeeded in this easy manner in becoming the *bête noire* of the Continental courts, he could not fail to be set up as the truly English minister at home. Although a Tory by origin, he has introduced into the management of foreign affairs all the shams that form the essence of Whiggism. He knows how to conciliate a large phraseology with narrow views, how to clothe the policy of a peace-mongering middle class in the haughty language of England's aristocratic past, how to appear an aggressor where he yields, and a defender where he betrays, how to manage his apparent enemy, and how to exasperate his pretended ally, how to find himself, at the opportune moment, on the side of the stronger against the weak, and how to utter brave words in the act of running away.

Accused by one party of being in the pay of Russia, he is supposed by the others to be made up of Carbonarism.<sup>3</sup> If, in 1848, he had to defend himself against a motion of impeachment for having acted as the minister of Nicholas, he had, in 1850, the satisfaction of being persecuted by a conspiracy of foreign ambassadors, which was successful in the House of Lords but baffled in the House of Commons. If he has betrayed foreign peoples, he did it with great politeness, politeness being the small coin of the devil, which he gives in change for the lifeblood of his dupes. If the oppressors were always sure of his active support, the oppressed never lacked a great ostentation of his rhetorical generosity. Poles, Italians, Hungarians, Germans, found him in office whenever they were crushed, but their despots suspected him always of secret conspiracy with the victims he had already allowed them to make. At all events, it has been till now a probable chance of success to have him for one's adversary, and a sure

<sup>3</sup> A term derived from the Carbonari, a secret revolutionary society in the Latin countries of southern and southwestern Europe during the early nineteenth century. The Carbonari were instrumental in uprisings in Piedmont, Naples, and Spain in 1820 and 1821.

chance of ruin to have him for one's friend. But, if his art of diplomacy does not shine in the actual results of his foreign negotiations, it shines the more brilliantly in the construction he has induced the English people to lay upon them, by accepting phrases for facts, phantoms for realities, and high-sounding pretexts for shabby motives.

Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston, deriving his title from a peerage of Ireland, was nominated Lord of the Admiralty in 1807, on the formation of the Duke of Portland's administration. In 1809 he was created Secretary at War, and continued to hold this office until May 1828. In 1830 he went over to the Whigs, who made him their permanent Minister of Foreign Affairs. Excepting the intervals of Tory administration from November 1834 till April 1835, and from 1841 to 1846, he is responsible for the whole foreign policy of England from the Revolution of 1830 till December 1851.

Is it not a very curious thing to find, at first view, this Quixote of free institutions and this Pindar of the "glories of the constitutional system," a permanent and active member of the Tory administrations of Mr. Percival, the Earl of Liverpool, Mr. Canning, Lord Goderich and the Duke of Wellington, during the fatal epoch when the anti-Jacobin war was carried on, the monster debt contracted, the Corn Laws enacted, foreign troops stationed in England,<sup>4</sup> the people "bled" from time to time, the press gagged, meetings suppressed, the mass of the nation disarmed, individual liberty, together with the regular jurisdiction of the courts, suspended, the whole country placed as it were under a state of siege—in one word, during the most infamous and most reactionary epoch of English history?

His debut in parliamentary life was of a no less characteristic sort. On February 3, 1808, he rose to defend—what? Secrecy in diplomatic negotiations, and the most disgusting

<sup>4</sup> Marx here alludes to the numerous foreign troops (Germans, Swiss, Greeks, and others) who served in the British army during the Napoleonic Wars.



act ever committed by any nation against another nation, namely, the bombardment of Copenhagen and the capture of the Danish fleet at a time when England was supposed to be in profound peace with Denmark.<sup>5</sup> As to the first point, he stated that, in this particular case, His Majesty's ministers "are pledged to security," but he improved on this statement: "I also object generally to making public the working of diplomacy, because it is the tendency of disclosures in that department to shut up future sources of information." Vidocq would have defended the identical cause in the identical terms. As to the act of piracy itself, while admitting that Denmark had evidenced no hostility whatever to Great Britain, he justified the bombarding its capital and the stealing its fleet on the plea that it had been done to prevent Danish neutrality from being converted into open hostility on the compulsion of France. This was the new law of nations he proclaimed.

When again speechifying, we find this English minister *par excellence* engaged in the defense of the foreign troops, called over from the Continent to England with the express mission of maintaining forcibly the oligarchic rule, to establish which William had come over in 1688, accompanied by his Dutch troops. To the well-founded "apprehensions for the liberties of the country," originating from the presence of the King's German Legion, Palmerston answered with great flippancy of manner: "Why should we not have 16,000 of those foreigners at home, while you know that we employ a far larger proportion of foreigners abroad?" When similar "apprehensions" arose from the large standing army, maintained since 1815 in England, he found "a sufficient protection of the Constitution in the very constitution of our army," a large proportion of the officers being "men of property and connections." When the large standing army was attacked from a financial point of view, he made the curious discovery

<sup>5</sup> The British bombarded Copenhagen in September 1807, during the period of Napoleon's Continental blockade.

that "much of our commercial embarrassment has been caused by our former low peace establishment." When the "burdens of the country" and the "misery of the people" were contrasted with the vast military expenditure, he reminded Parliament that those burdens and that misery "were the price which we [the English oligarchy] agreed to pay for our freedom and independence."

If, in his eyes, military despotism was to be apprehended, it was only from the exertions of "those self-called but misled reformers who demand that sort of reform in the country which, according to every just principle of government, must end, if it were acceded to, in a military despotism." While large standing armies were thus his panacea for maintaining the Constitution of the country, corporal punishment and flogging were his panacea for maintaining the constitution of the army. He defended flogging in the debates on the Mutiny Bill<sup>6</sup> on March 5, 1824; he declared it to be "absolutely indispensable" on March 11, 1825; he recommended it again on March 10, 1828; he stood by it in the debates of April 1833, and he has proved a true amateur of flogging on every subsequent occasion. There has existed no abuse in the army which he would not gift with plausible reasons, if it happened to foster the momentary interests of aristocratic parasites. An instance of this may be found in the debates on the sale of half-pay commissions, on March 12, 1828.

Lord Palmerston likes to parade his constant exertions for the establishment of religious liberty. Now, he voted against Lord John Russell's motion for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts,<sup>7</sup> and why? Because he was "a warm and zealous friend to religious liberty, and could, therefore, not allow the Dissenters to be relieved from imaginary griev-

<sup>6</sup> The Mutiny Bill was the act embodying the regulations governing the British Army and was annually reaffirmed by Parliament from 1689 until 1881, when it was superseded by the Army Act.

<sup>7</sup> The Test and Corporation Act, passed in 1673, required that every holder of public office in urban corporations must receive communion according to the Church of England, and must reject under oath the specific dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church. It was repealed in 1828.

ances, while real inflictions pressed upon the Catholics." "I regret," he informs us, "to see the increasing number of Dissenters. It is my wish that the Established Church should be the predominant one in this country"; and from pure love and zeal for religious liberty he wants this Established Church to be fed at the expense of the misbelievers. His jocosose lordship accuses the rich Dissenters of satisfying the ecclesiastical wants of the poorer ones, while "with the Church of England it is the poor alone who want church accommodations; it would be preposterous to say that the poor ought to subscribe for churches out of their small earnings." It would of course be yet more preposterous to say that the rich members of the Established Church ought to subscribe for churches out of their large earnings.

Let us now look at his exertions for Catholic Emancipation<sup>8</sup>—one of his great aims having been to gain the gratitude of the Irish people. We do not dwell on the circumstance that, having declared himself for Catholic Emancipation when a member of the Canning ministry, he nevertheless entered the Wellington ministry avowedly hostile to that measure. Did Lord Palmerston then consider religious liberty as one of the rights of man, not to be intermeddled with by legislation? He may answer for himself: "Although I wish the Catholic claims to be considered, I never will admit these claims to stand upon the *ground of right*. If I thought the Catholics were asking for their right, I, for one, would not go into the Committee." And why did he oppose their asking for their right? "Because the legislature of a country has the right to impose such political disabilities upon any class of the community as it may deem necessary for the safety and the welfare of the whole. This belongs to the *fundamental principles* on which a civilized government is founded." Here, then, we have the most cynical confession ever made, that the mass of the people have no rights at all, but that they may enjoy that

<sup>8</sup> An act of 1829 gave Roman Catholics the right to sit in Parliament and to hold some public offices.

quantity of immunities the legislature, or in other words, the ruling class, may deem fit to grant them. In accordance with this, Lord Palmerston declared, in plain words, "Catholic Emancipation to be a measure of grace and favor."

It was then entirely upon the ground of expediency that he condescended to discontinue the Catholic disabilities. And what was lurking behind this expediency? Being himself one of the great Irish landed proprietors, he wanted to entertain the delusion that "other remedies for Irish evils than Emancipation are impossible"; that it would cure absenteeism, and prove a cheap substitute for Poor Laws. This great philanthropist, who afterward cleared his Irish estates of their Irish natives, could not allow Irish misery to darken, even for one moment, with its inauspicious clouds, the bright sky over the Parliament of landlords and money lords. "It is true," he exclaims, "that the peasantry of Ireland do not enjoy all the comforts which are enjoyed by the peasantry of England." Only think of all the comforts enjoyed by a family at the rate of seven shillings a week. "Still," he continues, "still, however, the Irish peasant has his comforts. He is well supplied with fuel, and is seldom [only five days out of six] at a loss for food." But this is not all the comfort he has. He has a greater "cheerfulness of mind" than his English fellow sufferer. As to the extortions of Irish landlords, he deals with them in a no less pleasant way than with the comforts of the Irish peasantry. "It is said that the Irish landlord insists on the highest possible rent that can be extorted. Why, Sir, I believe that is not a singular circumstance. Certainly, in England the landlord does the same thing." Are we, then, to be surprised that this man, so deeply initiated into the mysteries of "the glories of the English Constitution" and the comforts of "free institutions," aspires at spreading them all over the Continent!

It is known that, when the reform movement had grown irresistible, Lord Palmerston deserted the camp of the Tories, and skillfully effected his junction with the Whigs. We

have seen that he once apprehended danger of military despotism from the demands of the self-called reformers. Nevertheless, as early as 1828 he patronized the extension of the franchise to such large industrial places as Birmingham, Leeds, and Manchester, "*not because I am a friend to Reform in principle, but because I am its decided enemy*," calculating that some timely compromise with the overgrown factory kings might be the only way of escaping "*the introduction of general reform*." Having passed over to the Whigs, he did not even pretend that their Reform Bill aimed at breaking through the narrow trammels of the Venetian Constitution, but, on the contrary, at increasing its strength and solidity, by severing the middle-class interest from the people's opposition. "The feelings of the middle class will be changed, and their dissatisfaction will be converted into that attachment to the Constitution which will give to it a vast increase of strength and solidity." He consoled the peers by telling them that the Reform Bill would neither weaken "the influence of the House of Lords" nor put a stop to its "interfering in elections." He told the aristocracy that the Constitution was not to lose its feudal character, "the landed interest being the great foundation upon which rests the fabric of society and the institutions of the country." He allayed their fears by throwing out ironical hints that "we have been charged with not being in earnest or sincere in our desire to give to the people a real representation," that "it was said we only proposed to give a different form of influence to the aristocracy and the landed interest." He even went so far as to own that, beside the inevitable concessions to be made to the overgrown manufacturing interest, "disfranchisement," that is to say, a new kind of distribution of rotten boroughs between the Tory aristocrats and the Whig aristocrats, was the chief and leading principle of the Reform Bill.

We will now return to his performances in the foreign branch of policy during the Tory period of his life. In 1823, when, in consequence of the resolutions of the Congress of

Verona, a French army was marched into Spain, in order to overturn the constitution of that country and to deliver it up to the merciless vengeance of the Bourbon idiot and his suite of bigot monks, Lord Palmerston disclaimed any Quixotic crusade for "abstract principles"—any intervention in favor of a people whose heroic resistance had saved England from Napoleon. The words he addressed on that occasion to his Whig opponents are a true and lively picture of his own foreign policy, after he had become their permanent Minister of Foreign Affairs. "Some," said he, "would have had us use threats in negotiation without being prepared for going to war if negotiation failed. To have talked of war and to have meant neutrality—to have threatened an army and to have retreated behind a state-paper—to have brandished the sword of defiance in the hour of deliberation and to have ended in a penful of protests on the day of battle, would have been the conduct of a cowardly bully, and would have made us the object of contempt and the laughing-stock of Europe."

At last we arrive at the Grecian and Turkish debates, which afforded Lord Palmerston the first opportunity of displaying publicly his talents as the unflinching and persevering advocate of Russia in the cabinet and in the House. One by one he reechoed the watchwords given by Russia, of Turkish monstrosity—Greek civilization, religious liberty, Christianity, etc. At first we meet him repudiating, as the Minister of War, any intention of passing a censure "upon the meritorious conduct of Admiral Codrington," which caused the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino, although he admitted that "the battle took place against a power with which we are not at war." After this, having left office, he opened his long series of attacks upon Lord Aberdeen by reproaching him with having been too slow in the execution of the Czar's orders.

Has there been much more energy and promptitude in fulfilling our engagements to Greece? July, 1829, is coming fast

upon us, and the treaty of July, 1827, is still unexecuted. The Morea indeed, has been cleared of the Turks, but why were the arms of France checked at the Isthmus of Corinth? The narrow policy of England stepped in and arrested her progress. But why do not the allies deal with the country north of the Isthmus as they have done with that to the south, by occupying at once all that which must be assigned to Greece? I should have thought that the allies had had enough of negotiating with Turkey about Greece.

It is well known that it was Prince Metternich who at that time opposed the encroachments of Russia, and that her diplomatic agents, such as Pozzo di Borge, Prince Lieven, and others, had accordingly received orders to denounce Austria as the stupid ally of the Sultan. Lord Palmerston followed of course in the beaten track: "By the narrowness of her views, the unfortunate prejudices of her policy, Austria has almost reduced herself to the level of a second-rate power," and in consequence of the temporizing policy of Aberdeen,

England is now represented as the keystone of that arch of which Miguel and Spain and Austria and Mahmud, are the component parts. It is thus that people see in the delay in executing the treaty of July not so much fear of Turkish resistance, as invincible repugnance to Grecian freedom.

For half a century one phrase has stood as a barrier between Russia and Constantinople—the phrase of the integrity of the Turkish Empire being necessary to the balance of power. "I object," exclaims Palmerston on Feb. 5, 1830, "to the policy of making the integrity of the Turkish dominion in Europe an object essentially necessary to the interests of Christian and civilized Europe." Again he returns to attack Aberdeen:

I, for one, shall not be satisfied with a number of dispatches from the Government of England, which will no doubt read

well and smooth enough, urging in general terms, the propriety of conciliating Russia, but accompanied, perhaps, by strong expression of the regard which England bears to Turkey, which when read by an interested party, might easily be made to appear more than was really intended. I should like to see, that while England adopts a firm resolution—almost the only course she could adopt—upon no consideration and in no event to take part with Turkey in that war, that that decision was fairly and frankly communicated to the Turk. There are three merciless things: time, fire and the Sultan.

Before proceeding further, let us recall to memory a few historical facts: Russia having seized on Gokchek, a strip of land bordering on the lake of Teheran (the undisputed possession of Persia), demanded, as the price of its evacuation, the abandonment of Capan—another portion of the Persian territory. Persia, not yielding, was overrun, vanquished, and forced to subscribe to the Treaty of Turcomanchai, in February 1828. According to this treaty, Persia had to pay an indemnity of two millions sterling to Russia, to cede the provinces of Erivan and Nuktchivan, including the fortresses of Erivan and Abassabad, in order to define the common frontier by the Araxes; this being the only means, as Nicholas pretended, of preventing any future disputes between the two empires. But at the same time he refused to give back Talish and Moghan, situated beyond the Russian side of the Araxes. Finally, Persia was also bound to maintain no navy on the Caspian Sea. Such were the origin and the results of the Russo-Persian war. As to the religion and the liberty of Greece, Russia cared, then, as much about them as the "God of the Russians" cares now about the keys of the Holy Sepulcher, and the famous Cupola. It was the traditional policy of Russia to excite the Grecians to revolt and then to abandon them to the vengeance of the Sultan. So profound was her sympathy for the regeneration of Hellas that she treated them as rebels at the Congress of Verona, acknowledging the Sultan's right to exclude all foreign intervention between



himself and his Christian subjects. In fact, the Czar "offered to aid the Porte in suppressing the Greek rebellion"—a proposition which was, of course, rejected. Having failed in this attempt, he turned round upon the great powers, by proposing "to march an army into Turkey, for the purpose of dictating peace under the walls of the Seraglio." But, in order to hold his hands bound by common act, the powers concluded with him a treaty at London, on July 6, 1827, by which they mutually engaged to enforce the adjustment of the differences between Turkey and Greece. A few months after signing that treaty, Russia concluded with Turkey the Treaty of Akkerman, on the express understanding that she should renounce all interference in Greece. This treaty had been brought about after Russia had induced the Prince Royal of Persia to invade the Ottoman dominions, and after she had inflicted the greatest injuries on the Porte in order to drive it to a rupture. All this having taken place, the resolutions of the London treaties of July 6, 1827, were presented, one fine morning, to the Porte, in the name of Russia and the other powers.

In consequence of the complications resulting from the Russian lies and frauds, the Czar at last found a pretext to begin the war of 1828 and 1829. This was terminated by the Treaty of Adrianople, whose substance is contained in the following quotation from O'Neill's celebrated pamphlet on the progress of Russia in the East:

By the treaty of Adrianople the Czar acquired Anapa and Poti, with a considerable extent of coast on the Black Sea, a portion of the Pachalik of Akhilska, with the two fortresses of Akhilska and Akhilkillak, the islands formed by the mouth of the Danube. The destruction of the Turkish fortress of Georgiova and the abandonment by Turkey of the right bank of the Danube to the distance of several miles from the river, were stipulated—partly by force, and partly by the influence of the priesthood many thousand families of the Armenians were removed from the Turkish provinces in Asia to the Czar's terri-

tories. He established for his own subjects in Turkey, an exemption from all responsibility to the national authorities, and burdened the Porte with an immense debt under the name of expenses for the war and for commercial losses, and finally retained Moldavia and Wallachia and Silistria, in pledge for its payment. Having by this treaty imposed upon Turkey the acceptance of the protocol of March 22, which secured to her the suzeraineté of Greece, and a yearly tribute from this country, Russia used all her influence to procure the *independence of Greece*, which was indeed erected into an independent state; of which Count Cape d'Istria, *who had been a Russian Minister*, was named *President*.

These are the facts. Now look at the picture drawn of them by the master hand of Lord Palmerston in a speech in the House of Commons on Aug. 7, 1832: "It is perfectly true that the war between Russia and Turkey arose out of aggressions made by Turkey on the commerce and rights of Russia, and violations of treaties." We find him, however, as the Whig Minister of Foreign Affairs improving on this theme:

The honourable and gallant member [Col. Evans] has represented the conduct of Russia as one of unvarying aggression upon other States, from 1815 to the present time. He adverted more particularly to the wars of Russia and Turkey. Russia was the aggressor in neither of them, and although the result of the Persian war was an aggrandizement of her power, *it was not a result of her own seeking*. Again, in the Turkish war Russia was not the aggressor. It would be intriguing to the House to detail all the provocations Turkey offered to Russia; but I believe there cannot be a doubt that she violated all the provisions of the Treaty of Ackerman, and then, upon complaint made, denied redress; so that, *if ever there was a just ground for going to war Russia had it for going to war with Turkey*. She did not, however, on that occasion acquire any increase of territory, at least in Europe. I know that there was a continued occupation of certain points [Moldavia and Wallachia are only points, and the mouths of the Danube are mere zeros]

and some additional acquisitions on the Euxine in Asia, but she had an agreement with the other European powers, that success in that war should not lead to *any* aggrandizement in Europe.

Our readers will now understand Sir Robert Peel's telling Lord Palmerston in a public session of the House, that "he did not know whose representative he was." This was a plain way of saying he was not the representative of liberty, or honesty, or what makes the best character of England. Such as the noble lord was then, and in the earlier part of his career which we have reviewed, he is at this day, and none who know him can expect at his hands any but false service to the cause of justice and human rights in the present momentous crisis. What remains of his public history we leave for another day; we are sorry to say that it is not the better half.

(Engels)

## **England and Russia**

---

*Not Dated / Published January 11, 1854*

Lord Palmerston's resignation seems to be working in England all the marvels he could have hoped from it. While the public indignation is becoming more and more active against the cabinet he has abandoned, and whose policy he has on all occasions, up to the last moment of his connection with them, emphatically endorsed, the very parties loudest in their denunciations of the coalition vie with each other in the praise of Palmerston. And while they call for energetic and honorable resistance to the encroachments of Russia, on the one hand, they seem to desire nothing so much as the restoration of their favorite statesman to high office on the other. Thus this accomplished and relentless actor deludes the world. It would be an amusing spectacle were the interests involved less momentous. How deep is the delusion we have

already had occasion to show, and now add below a new demonstration of the truth that, for some reason or other, Lord Palmerston has steadily labored for the advancement of Russia, and has used England for that purpose. Those who seek to look behind the scenes of current history, and to judge events and men at their real value, will, we think, find our exposure instructive.

One glance over the map of Europe will show us on the western side of the Black Sea the outlets of the Danube, the only river which springs up in the very heart of Europe, and may be said to form a natural highway to Asia. Exactly opposite, on the eastern side of the Euxine, southwards of the river Kuban, begins the mountainous range of the Caucasus, which, stretching from the Black Sea to the Caspian in a southeasterly direction for some 700 miles, separates Europe from Asia.

The power which holds the outlets of the Danube necessarily holds the Danube also, the highway to Asia, and with it controls a great deal of the commerce of Switzerland, Germany, Hungary, Turkey, and, above all, of Moldavia and Wallachia. But give the same power the Caucasus in addition, and the Black Sea will exclusively belong to it as a *mare clausum*, and only Constantinople and the Dardanelles are wanted in order to shut its door. The possession of the Caucasian mountains insures at once the control of Trebizond, and, through its position with reference to the Caspian Sea, of the northern seaboard of Persia.

The greedy eye of Russia has embraced at once the outlets of the Danube and the mountainous range of the Caucasus. There the business in hand was to conquer supremacy; here, to maintain it. The chains of the Caucasus mountains separate southern Russia from the luxurious provinces of Georgia, Mingrelia, Imeritia, and Gurriel, which the Muscovite had wrested from the Mussulman. Thus the foot of the monster empire is cut off from its main body. The only military road winds from Mozdok to Tiflis through the narrow

pass of Darien, secured by a continuous chain of entrenched places, and exposed on both sides to eternal attacks from the hostile Caucasian tribes. The union of the Caucasian tribes under one military chief might even endanger the bordering country of the Cossacks. "The thought of the dreadful consequences which a union of the hostile Caucasians under one head would produce in the south of Russia fills one with terror," exclaims Mr. Kapffer, a German, who presided over the scientific commission which in 1829 accompanied the expedition of General Etrennel to Elbruz.

At this very moment our attention is directed with equal anxiety to the banks of the Danube, where Russia has seized the two granaries of Europe, and to the Caucasus, where she is menaced with expulsion from Georgia. Her movements in both these regions have a common origin. It was by the Treaty of Adrianople that the usurpation of Moldo-Wallachia was prepared, and that were founded her claims on the Caucasus.

Art. IV of that treaty has the following stipulation:

All the countries situated to the north and east of the line of demarcation between the two empires (Russia and Turkey) towards Georgia, Imeritia, and Guriel, as well as all the shore of the Black Sea, from the mouth of the Kuban as far as the port of St. Nicholas inclusively, shall remain under the domination of Russia.

With regard to the Danube the same treaty stipulates:

The frontier line will follow the course of the Danube to the mouth of St. George, leaving all the islands formed by the different branches in the possession of Russia. The right bank will remain, as formerly, in the possession of the Ottoman Porte. It is, however, agreed that that right bank, from the point where the arm of St. George departs from that of Sulina, shall remain *uninhabited* to a distance of two hours (six miles) from the river, and that no kind of structure shall be raised

there; and, in *like manner*, on the islands which still remain in the possession of Russia. With the exception of quarantines which will be there established, it will not be permitted to make any other establishment or fortification.

Both these paragraphs, inasmuch as they secured to Russia new possessions and exclusive commercial advantages, infringe on the protocol of April 4, 1826, drawn up by the Duke of Wellington at St. Petersburg, and on the treaty of July 6, 1827, concluded between Russia and the other powers at London. The English government, therefore, refused to recognize the Treaty of Adrianople. The Duke of Wellington protested against it. Lord Aberdeen protested against it, as Lord Mahon says:

In a dispatch to Lord Heytesbury, dated 31st October, 1829, he commented with no small dissatisfaction on many parts of the Treaty of Adrianople, and especially noticed the stipulations respecting the islands of the Danube. He denies that that treaty has respected the territorial rights of sovereignty of the Porte, and the condition and the interests of all maritime States in the Mediterranean.

Earl Grey said:

That the independence of the Porte would be sacrificed, and the peace of Europe endangered by this being agreed to.

Lord Palmerston himself, in his speech of March 17, 1837, informs us:

As far as the extension of the Russian frontier is concerned on the mouth of the Danube, the south of the Caucasus, and the shores of the Black Sea, it is certainly not consistent with the solemn declaration made by Russia in the face of Europe previous to the commencement of the Turkish war.

The eastern shores of the Black Sea, by blockading which and cutting off the supply of arms and gunpowder to the

northwestern Circassian districts, Russia could alone hope to realize her claim on the Caucasus she had wrested from Turkey—the shore of the Black Sea, as well as the outlets of the Danube, are certainly not places “where no English action could possibly take place,” as was lamented by Lord Palmerston in the case of Cracow. By what mysterious contrivance, then, has the Muscovite, nevertheless, succeeded in blocking up the Danube, in blockading the shore of the Euxine, and in forcing England to submit not only to the Treaty of Adrianople, but at the same time to the violations by Russia herself of that identical treaty?

These questions were put to the noble viscount in the House of Commons on April 20, 1836. Petitions were simultaneously presented from the merchants of London, of Glasgow, and other commercial towns, against the fiscal regulations of Russia on the Black Sea, and her enactments and restrictions, intended to interrupt English commerce on the Danube.

There had appeared on February 7, 1836, a ukase which, by virtue of the Treaty of Adrianople, established a quarantine on one of the islands formed by the mouths of the Danube. In order to execute the quarantine regulations, Russia claimed a right of boarding and search, of levying fees, and seizing and marching off to Odessa refractory sailors proceeding on their voyage up the Danube. Before the quarantine was established, or rather before, under the false pretense of a quarantine, a fort and a customhouse were erected, the Russian authorities had thrown out feelers to ascertain what risk they would run with the British government. Lord Durham, acting upon instructions received from England, remonstrated with the Russian government for these hindrances to British trade. He was referred to Count Nesselrode. Count Nesselrode referred to the Governor of South Russia, and the Governor of South Russia again referred to the Consul at Galatz, who communicated with the British Consul at Braila, who was instructed to send down the cap-



tains from whom toll had been exacted to the mouth of the Danube, the scene of their injuries, in order that inquiry might be made into the subject, it being well known that the captains referred to were then in England.

The formal ukase of February 7, 1836, aroused, however, the general attention of British merchants, since, as Mr. Stewart stated in the House of Commons on April 20, 1836,

many ships had sailed, and others were going out, to whose captains strict orders had been given not to submit to the right of boarding and search which Russia claimed. The fate of these ships must be inevitable, unless some expression of opinion was made on the part of the House. Unless that were done British shipping, to the amount of not less than 5,000 tons, would be seized and marched off to Odessa, until the insolent commands of Russia were complied with.

We have stated that Russia acquired the marshy islands at the mouths of the Danube in virtue of the Treaty of Adrianople, which treaty was a violation of that which she had previously concluded with England and the other powers on July 26, 1827. Her bristling the mouths of the Danube with fortifications, and these fortifications with guns, was also a violation of the Treaty of Adrianople, which expressly prohibited any fortifications being erected within six miles of the river. The exacting of tolls and the obstruction of the navigation was a violation of the Treaty of Vienna, which declared that "the navigation of rivers along their whole course, from the point where each of them became navigable to its mouth, shall be entirely free," that "the amount of the duties shall, in no case, exceed those now (in 1815) paid," and that "no increase shall take place except with the common consent of the States bordering on the river." Thus, then, the only points on which Russia could plead "not guilty" were an infraction of the treaty of 1827 by the Treaty of Adrianople, an open violation by herself of the Treaty of Adrianople, and an insolent rupture of the Treaty of Vienna.

It appeared quite impossible to wring out of Lord Palmerston any declaration whether he did, or did not, recognize the Treaty of Adrianople. As to the Treaty of Vienna,

he had received no *official* information that anything had occurred which was not warranted by the treaty. When such a statement should be made by the parties concerned, it would be dealt with in such a manner as the law advisers of the Crown should deem consistent with the rights of the subjects of England.

By Art. V of the Treaty of Adrianople, Russia guarantees "the prosperity of the Danubian Principalities and full liberty of trade for them." Now Mr. Patrick Stewart proved that the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia were objects of deadly jealousy to Russia, as their trade had taken a sudden development since 1834, as they vied with Russia's own staple production, as Galatz was becoming the great depot of all the grain of the Danube and driving Odessa out of the market. To this Lord Palmerston answered in these words:

If my honourable friend had been able to show, that whereas some years ago we had had a large and important commerce with Turkey, and that that commerce had by the aggression of other countries or by the neglect of the Government of this, dwindled down to an inconsiderable trade, then there might have been ground to call upon Parliament. In lieu of such an occurrence, my honourable friend has shown that during the last few years the trade with Turkey has risen from next to nothing to a very considerable amount.

"Russia obstructs the Danube navigation, because the trade of the Principalities is growing important," says Mr. Stewart. "But she did not do so when that trade was next to nothing," answers Lord Palmerston. "You neglect to oppose Russia's recent encroachments on the Danube," says Mr.

Stewart. "But did we do so before these encroachments were ventured upon?" asks Lord Palmerston. His lordship succeeded in preventing the House from coming to a resolution by assuring it that "there was no disposition of Her Majesty's Government to submit to aggressions on the part of any Power, be that Power what it may, and be it more or less strong," and by warning the House that "they should also cautiously abstain from anything which might be construed by other Powers, and reasonably so, as being a provocation on their part."

A week after these debates had taken place in the House of Commons, a British merchant addressed a letter to Lord Palmerston with regard to the Russian ukase. He was answered by the Under Secretary at the Foreign Office as follows:

I am directed by Viscount Palmerston to acquaint you that his lordship has called upon the law adviser for the Crown for his opinion as to the regulations promulgated by the Russian ukase on February 7, 1836; but, in the meantime, Lord Palmerston directs me to acquaint you, with respect to the latter part of your letter, that it is the opinion of His Majesty's Government that no toll is justly demanded by the Russian authorities at the mouth of the Danube, and you have acted properly in directing your agents to refuse to pay it.

The merchant, on acting according to this letter, was abandoned to Russia by the noble lord; a Russian toll, as Mr. Urquhart states, is now exacted in London and Liverpool by Russian consuls on every English ship sailing for the Turkish ports of the Danube, and the quarantine still stands on the island of Leti.

But Russia did not limit her invasion of the Danube to a quarantine established, to fortifications erected, and to tolls exacted. The only mouth of the Danube still navigable, the Sulina mouth, came into the possession of Russia through

the Treaty of Adrianople. As long as it was possessed by the Turks, a depth of water was kept in the channel from 14 to 16 feet. Since it has been possessed by Russia, the water has become reduced to 8 feet, a depth wholly inadequate to the conveyance of vessels employed in the corn trade. Now, Russia is a party to the Treaty of Vienna, and that treaty stipulates, in Article 113, that "each State shall be at the expense of keeping in good repair the towing paths, and shall maintain the necessary works in order that no obstruction shall be experienced by the navigation." Russia found no better means for keeping the channel in a navigable state than choking up its mouth with an accumulation of sand and mud, and paving its bar with shipwrecks. To this systematic and protracted violation of the Treaty of Vienna, Russia has added another violation of the Treaty of Adrianople, which forbids the erecting of any establishment at the mouth of the Sulina, except for quarantine and lighthouse purposes, since, at her dictation, there has sprung up there a small Russian town, supported by the extortions, the occasion for which has been afforded by the delays and expenses for lighterage consequent upon the obstruction of the channel.

"Of what use," said Lord Palmerston, on April 30, 1823, "is it to dwell upon abstract principles with despotic Governments who are accused of measuring right by power, and of ruling their conduct by expediency, and not by justice?" According to his own maxim the noble lord took good care to content himself with dwelling upon abstract principles with the despotic government of Russia. But he went further. While he assured the House on July 6, 1840, that the freedom of the Danube was "guaranteed by the Treaty of Vienna"; and while he lamented on July 13, 1840, that although the occupation of Cracow was a violation of the Treaty of Vienna, "there were no means of enforcing the opinion of England, because Cracow was evidently a place where no English action could possibly take place," he, two days later,

concluded a treaty with Russia, by virtue of which treaty the Dardanelles were hermetically closed to English men-of-war during peace with Turkey, thus bereaving England of the only means of enforcing the Treaty of Vienna, and transforming the Euxine into "a place where no English action could possibly take place." This point once obtained, he gave a sham satisfaction to public opinion by firing off a whole battery of papers reminding "the despotic Government" which "measures right by power, and rules its conduct by expediency, and not by justice," in a very sententious and sentimental manner, that "Russia, when she compelled Turkey to cede to her the outlet of a great European river which forms the commercial highway for the mutual intercourse of many nations, undertook duties and responsibilities to other States, which she should take a pride in making good." To such a homily upon abstract principles, Count Nesselrode answered steadily and phlegmatically that "the subject should be carefully examined," and from time to time he expressed "a feeling of soreness on the part of the Imperial Government at the mistrust manifested as to their intentions."

Thus, through the management of the noble lord, things have arrived in 1853 at the point where the navigation of the Danube has been declared *impossible*, and wheat is rotting in the mouth of the Sulina, while famine threatens to invade France, England, and the south of Europe. Thus Russia has added, as *The Times* said, "to her other important possessions, that of an iron gate between the Danube and the Euxine." She has acquired the key of the Danube and of a bread-screw which she can put on whenever the policy of Western Europe becomes obnoxious to punishment.

The mystery, however, of Lord Palmerston's transactions with Russia as to her schemes on the Danube was not revealed till during the course of the debates on Circassia. Then it was proved by Mr. Anstey on February 23, 1848, that "the noble Viscount's first act on coming into office (as the

Minister of Foreign Affairs) was to accept the Treaty of Adrianople"—the same treaty against which the Duke of Wellington and Lord Aberdeen had protested.

How this was done, and how Circassia was delivered by Lord Palmerston to Russia, as far as he had the power to deliver it, may perhaps form the subject of another article.

(Engels)

## Lord John Russell

---

*Not Dated / Published August 28, 1855*

We have recently had occasion to notice the funeral obsequies of this politically departed statesman, and to utter a few farewell words above his grave. The past which his birth, and his position as the only presentable member of the great revolutionary family and old Whig house of Bedford, enabled him to play in the drama of European affairs, and the connection of his name with some of the great progressive measures of the day, seem to us to entitle him to a somewhat more lengthened and analytic obituary.

"If I was a painter," said old Cobbett, "there would I place the old oak (the British Constitution), corroded at the root, his top dead, his trunk hollow, loosened at his base, rocking with every blast, and there would I place Lord John Russell, in the person of a tom-tit, endeavoring to put all right by

picking at a nest of animalculae seated in the half-rotten bark of one of the meanest branches. There are some who even think that he is eating the buds while he pretends to clear the tree of injurious insects." So minute were Lord John Russell's reform efforts during his antediluvian career from 1813 to 1830; but minute as they were, they were not sincere, and he did not hesitate to retreat from them whenever they clashed with the attainment or retention of place.

Since 1807 the Whigs had pined in vain for a bite at the rich cherry of official salary and plunder, when in 1827 the formation of Canning's cabinet, with whom they pretended to agree on the subject of commerce and of foreign policy, seemed to afford them the long-sought-for opportunity. Russell, at that time, had given notice of one of his tomtit parliamentary reform motions. But upon Canning's stern declaration that he should oppose parliamentary reform to the end of his life, up rose Lord John in great haste and withdrew his motion, declaring that "parliamentary reform was a question on which there was a great diversity of opinion among those who advocated it, and to which the leaders of the Whigs were always unwilling to be pledged as to a party question. It was now for *the last time* that he brought forward this question. The people no longer wished for reform."

While sitting at Canning's back, he, who had made a merit of his noisy opposition to Castlereagh's six gagging acts,<sup>1</sup> refrained from voting on Mr. Hume's motion for the repeal of one of those six acts which made a man liable to banishment for life for uttering in print anything which had even a "tendency" to bring either house of Parliament into contempt. Thus, at the conclusion of the first period of his Parliamentary life, we find him fully concurring with the opinion of that Whig prototype, Horace Walpole, that "popular bills are never really proposed but as an engine of party, and not as a pledge for the realization of any such extravagant

<sup>1</sup> Six laws adopted in 1819 which severely limited freedom of the press and of assembly.



ideas." It was, then, by no means Lord J. Russell's fault that the motion for parliamentary reform, instead of being brought forward for the "last" time in 1827, was to make its reappearance four years later, on March 1st, 1831, in the shape of the famous bill. This bill, which he still exhibits as his great claim to the admiration of the world in general, and the gratitude of the English nation in particular, he had not even the merit of being the author of. In its principal features—the breaking up of the nomination boroughs, the addition of country members, the enfranchisement of copyholders, leaseholders, and some of the chief commercial towns—it was copied from the Reform Bill which Lord Grey (the chief of the Reform Ministry in 1831) had moved in the House of Commons as far back as the year 1797, and which he had taken good care to drop when a member of the Fox cabinet in 1806. It was the identical bill, slightly modified.

The ejection of Wellington from office, because he had declared against reform; the French Revolution of July; the threatening political unions formed by the middling and working classes at Birmingham, Manchester, London, and elsewhere; the rural war; the "bonfires" all over the most fertile counties of England ("Out of the fires came the Reform," says a celebrated writer)—all these circumstances absolutely compelled the Whigs to propose some measure of reform. It was their only means of rushing into office. They gave way grudgingly, slowly, and after vainly reiterated efforts at one time to shuffle out of the only liberal clauses of their own measure, and again to abandon it altogether, and to keep their places by a compromise with the Tories. They were prevented by the formidable attitude of the people, and the uncompromising opposition of the Tories. Hardly, however, had the Reform Bill become law, and begun to work, when, to quote Mr. Bright's words, "the people began to feel that they had been cheated." Never, perhaps, had a mighty, and, to all appearances, successful popular movement been turned into such a mock result. Not only were the working

classes altogether excluded from any political influence, but the middle classes themselves discovered that Lord Althorp, the soul of the reform cabinet, had not used a rhetorical figure when telling his Tory adversaries that "the Reform Bill was the most aristocratic act ever offered to the nation."

The new country representation still largely preponderated over that of the towns. The franchise of the tenants-at-will occupying at an annual value of £50 rendered the counties, still more efficiently than before, the tools of the aristocracy. The substitution of the £10 householders for the payers of scot and lot actually disfranchised a great number of former town voters. The new arrangements were, on the whole, calculated not for increasing middle-class influence, but for the exclusion of Tory and the promotion of Whig patronage. By a series of the most extraordinary tricks, frauds, and juggles, the inequality of the electoral districts was maintained, the monstrous disproportion between representation and constituency reconstructed. If some fifty-six rotten boroughs, each with a handful of inhabitants, were extinguished, whole counties and populous towns were transformed into rotten boroughs. Lord John Russell himself confesses, in his letter to the electors of Stroud on the principles of the Reform Act, that "the £10 franchise was fettered by regulation, and the annual registration was made a source of vexation and expense." Intimidation and patronage, where they could not be perpetuated, were replaced by bribery, which, from the passage of the Reform Bill, became the main prop of the British Constitution. Such was the reform of which Lord John was the mouthpiece, but not the author. The only clauses since proved to be due to his invention are that which compels all freeholders, except parsons, to have had a year of possession, and the other clause preserving Tavistock, the family rotten borough of the Russells. Russell was but a subordinate member of the Reform ministry, without a vote in the cabinet, viz: Paymaster of the Forces, from November 1830 to November 1834. He was, perhaps, the most

insignificant man among them. But from his being the son of the mighty Duke of Bedford he was singled out for the honor of introducing the bill into the House of Commons.<sup>2</sup>

Beside the Reform Bill discussion, Lord John distinguished himself by the acrimony and virulence with which he opposed all inquiry into the pension list. Some years later, when all the prominent members of the original reform cabinet, having been removed to the Lords, died out, or separated from the Whigs, Lord John not only entered upon their inheritance, but soon passed in the eyes of the country as the natural father of the bill of which he had been but the godfather by courtesy. On bringing in the Reform Bill, he said: "There can be no doubt that the *ballot* has much to recommend it; the arguments which I have heard advanced in its favor are as ingenious as any that I ever heard on any subject." As to short Parliaments, "that was a question of the utmost importance, which he left to be brought before the House by some other member at a future time, in order not to embarrass the great subject with details." On the 7th June, 1833, he pretended to have "refrained from bringing forward those two measures in order to avoid a collision with the Lords, although opinions deeply seated in his heart. He was convinced of their being most essential to the happiness, prosperity and welfare of this country."

Whether in consequence of this deeply seated conviction or not, he proved during his whole ministerial career the constant and relentless adversary of the ballot and short Parliaments. But when these declarations were made they served as expedients, in the first place to allay the suspicious democrats in the House of Commons, and in the second, to

<sup>2</sup> The German version (*Neue Oder Zeitung*, August 4, 1855) adds here: "One obstacle stood in the way of this family arrangement. During the reform movement, before 1830, Russell had always figured as 'Henry Brougham's little man.' Russell could not be entrusted with bringing in the Reform Bill as long as Brougham sat next to him in the Lower House. The obstacle was removed by throwing the vainglorious plebeian on the woolsack in the House of Lords."

frighten the refractory aristocrats in the House of Lords. But as soon as he had got possession of the new Court of Queen Victoria and fancied himself an immortal placeholder, out he came with his declaration of November 1837, wherein he justified the "extreme" length to which the "Reform Bill had gone" on the plea of barring the possibility of ever going further. He stated coolly that "the object of the Reform Bill was to increase the predominance of the *landed* interest, and it was intended as a *permanent settlement* of a great constitutional question." From this finality statement he earned the *sobriquet* of Finality John. But this finality was as false a pretense as his reform itself. It is true, he resisted Hume's motion for Parliamentary reform in 1848. With the combined forces of Whigs, Tories, and Peelites, he again defeated Hume on a similar motion in 1849. Emboldened by his conservative army of reserve, he then most haughtily spoke to the purport that

in framing and proposing the Reform Bill, what we wished was to adapt the representation of this House to the other powers of the State, and keep it in harmony with the Constitution. Mr. Bright and those who agree with him are so exceedingly narrow-minded, they have intellect and understanding bound up in such a narrow round, that it is quite impossible to get them to understand the great principles on which our ancestors founded the Constitution of the country, and which we, their successors, humbly admire and endeavor to follow. The existing system, though somewhat anomalous, worked well: the better for the anomalies.

However, being defeated in 1851 in his opposition to Locke King's bill for extending the country franchise to £10 occupiers, and even forced to resign for some days, Lord John suddenly made up his large mind on the necessity of a new Reform Bill. He did not state what his measure was to be, but he gave a promissory note payable at the next session of Parliament. How this move was judged of by his own confederates may be seen from *The Westminster Review*:

The pretence of the present Ministry to office had become a by-word of scorn and reproach; and at length, when its exclusion and party annihilation seemed imminent, forth comes Lord John with the promise of a new Reform Bill for 1852. Keep me in office, he says, till that time, and I will satisfy your longings by a large and liberal measure of reform. The Reformers of the House of Commons yielded to that reasoning.

In 1852 he indeed proposed a Reform Bill, this time of his own invention, but of such Lilliputian features that neither the Conservatives thought it worth while to attack nor the Liberals to support it. Still, it afforded the little man a pretext when resigning his ministry for throwing in his flight a Scythian dart at Lord Derby, by uttering the pompous threat that he would "insist on the extension of the suffrage." Hardly out of office, this child of expediency, now emphatically called by his own followers Foul-Weather Jack, summoned to his private residence at Chesham-place the different sections of the Liberal Party to make solemn asseverations of his own large-mindedness, and to hand to them another promissory bill of a larger amount of reform. When a member of the coalition cabinet, he amused the House with a Reform Bill which he knew would prove another Iphigenia, to be sacrificed by himself, another Agamemnon, for the benefit of another Trojan War. He performed the sacrifice indeed in true melodramatic style, his eyes filled with tears, but these soon passed away.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The German version adds here: "After the 'unsalaried' seat he held in the cabinet had been exchanged, through a petty intrigue against Mr. Strutt, a member of his own party, for the Presidency of the Privy Council, at a salary of £2,000.

"The second reform plan was supposed to prop up his tottering cabinet, the third was to bring down the Tory cabinet. The second was a subterfuge, the third—chicanery. The second he arranged in such a way that no one wanted to lend a hand; the third he submitted at a moment when no one could lend a hand. In both he showed that if destiny had made him a minister, nature had destined him to be a tinker, like Christopher Sly. Even of the first Reform Bill, the only one to become law, he grasped merely the oligarchic trickery, but not the historical meaning."

Another of the false pretenses on which he sought a niche in the temple of fame was his efforts on behalf of Ireland. Since the anti-Jacobin war, the Whigs, feeling themselves at an extremely low ebb in England, endeavored to fortify their position by an offensive and defensive alliance with Ireland. Stepping into office in 1806, they introduced and carried through the second reading a small Irish emancipation bill, which they then withdrew to flatter the bigot idiotcy of George III. Before and during the reform agitation they fawned upon O'Connell, and the hopes raised in Ireland served them as powerful engines of party. Yet their first act at the first meeting of the Reformed Parliament was a declaration of civil war against Ireland, a "brutal and bloody measure," the Irish Coercion "Red-Coat Tribunal Bill,"<sup>4</sup> according to which men were to be tried in Ireland by military officers, instead of by judges and juries. O'Connell was prosecuted for sedition. The Whigs fulfilled their ancient promises with "fire, imprisonment, transportation and even with death." They carried, however, the coercion bill only on the express stipulation that they would bring in and carry an Irish Church bill, with a clause stipulating that a certain portion of the revenues of the Established Church in Ireland should be placed at the disposal of Parliament, with the view to employ it for the benefit of Ireland. This clause was important from acknowledging the principle that Parliament had the power of expropriating the Established Church, a principle John Russell ought to be convinced of, the whole immense property of his family being formed of Church plunder. Having engaged to stand or fall by that bill, they hastened, on the ground of avoiding a collision with the Lords, to take out that very clause, the only part in the bill of any value at all. They then voted against and defeated their own measure. But when Peel came in, at the end of 1834, their Irish sym-

<sup>4</sup> An Act, passed in April 1833, for the suppression of the revolutionary movement in Ireland. It imposed virtual martial law under the British Viceroy.

thizers were roused again as by an electric shock. John Russell was the principal agent in bringing about, in 1835, the Lichfield House compact, through which the Whigs surrendered to O'Connell the Irish patronage, and O'Connell secured to them the Irish votes.<sup>5</sup> But there was wanting a pretext for ejecting the Tories. John, with characteristic impudence, chose as battlefield the ecclesiastical revenues of Ireland. He attacked and turned out Sir Robert Peel because of his resistance to that very clause, now called the appropriation clause, which the Reform ministry themselves had abandoned. The Melbourne cabinet was formed, and Lord John became leader in the House of Commons. He now began to boast on the one hand of his mental firmness, because although now in office he still adhered to his opinions on the appropriation clause; and on the other hand of his moral moderation in not acting upon those same opinions. He never acted upon them. In 1846, when Premier, he contrived to get rid of the opinions too. He professed that he could not conceive a more fatal measure than the disestablishment of the Church, and declined to take any further notice of the project of 1835.

In February 1833, John Russell as a member of the Reform ministry denounced Irish Repeal,<sup>6</sup> and stated that the real object of the agitation was "to overturn at once the United Parliament, and to establish, in place of King, Lords, and Commons of the United Kingdom, some parliament of which Mr. O'Connell was to be the leader and the chief." In February 1834, the repeal agitation was again denounced in the King's speech, and the Reform ministry proposed an address "to record in the most solemn manner the fixed determination of Parliament to maintain unimpaired and undisturbed the legislative union." Immediately on being shifted to the opposition benches, the very same John Russell declared

<sup>5</sup> The German version adds to this sentence the words: "within and without Parliament."

<sup>6</sup> Repeal of the union between Ireland and Great Britain established in 1801.

that, "with respect to the repeal of the union, the subject was open to amendment or question, like any other act of the Legislature."

In March 1846, Lord J. Russell, in strange alliance with the Tories, then burning with the passion to punish Peel for the repeal of the Corn Laws, broke up Peel's administration by an unconditional opposition to their Irish arms bill. He became Premier, and the first act of his government was an attempt to renew that same bill.<sup>7</sup> In 1844 he had denounced Peel for "having filled Ireland with troops, and with not governing but militarily occupying that country." In 1848 he occupied Ireland militarily, passed the felony acts, proclaimed the suspension of the habeas corpus, and gloried in the vigorous measures of the Clarendon reign.

Let us now look at his free-trade pretenses. The Corn Laws had been enacted in 1815, by the concurrence of Tories and Whigs.<sup>8</sup> At the parliamentary elections of 1835 and 1837,

<sup>7</sup> The German version (*Neue Oder Zeitung*, August 8, 1855) adds here: "But by doing so he only needlessly disgraced himself. O'Connell had already called monster meetings against Peel's bill and had collected 50,000 signatures to the petition he sponsored; he was in Dublin where he could put into action the whole technique of action. King Dan (as Daniel O'Connell was popularly called) would have lost his kingdom and revenues if at this moment he had appeared as Russell's accomplice. He therefore menacingly gave notice to the little man to withdraw his arms bill at once. Russell did so. In spite of his secret game with the Whigs, O'Connell in his masterly way managed to add insult to injury. In order that there might remain no doubt *at whose bidding* the retreat was being called, he on August 17 announced to the repealers assembled at Reconciliation Hall in Dublin that the arms bill had been withdrawn—announced it on the same day that John Russell made an identical announcement in the House of Commons."

<sup>8</sup> The German version (August 10, 1855) adds: "This was achieved not only by the Corn Laws—the laws against importing grain from abroad—artificially raising grain prices in many years. If we consider 1815–46 an average period we shall find that of still greater importance, perhaps, was the illusion of the tenant farmers that Corn Laws are able to keep grain prices in any case at a level fixed *a priori*. This illusion affected farm leases. To keep this illusion constantly alive we find Parliament steadily engaged in working out new and improved editions of the Corn Law of 1815. If corn prices proved intractable, if they fell despite the dictates of the Corn Laws, parliamentary committees were appointed to investigate the causes of the 'agricultural distress.' As a matter of fact the 'agricultural distress' was confined, in



John Russell stigmatized Corn Law reform as "mischievous, absurd, impracticable and unnecessary." Since he came into office he had resisted all such demands, "at first contemptuously, and then vehemently." He was a more thorough advocate for high Corn duties than Sir Robert Peel. During the prospect of dearth (1838-39) he and Melbourne did not contemplate any alterations in the existing duties.<sup>9</sup> The deficit, however, in the Whig exchequer rising to £7,500,000, and Palmerston's foreign policy threatening to involve England in a war with France, induced the House of Commons to pass, on June 4, 1841, upon the motion of Sir Robert Peel, a vote of no confidence in the Melbourne cabinet. The Whigs, always as eager to grasp at places as unable to fill and unwilling to leave them, endeavored, although in vain, to es-

---

so far as it was the subject of parliamentary investigation, to the discrepancy between the prices which the tenant farmer paid to the landlord for the land leased and the prices at which he sold his agricultural produce to the public—to the *discrepancy between the ground rent and grain prices*. It could therefore be abolished by the simple process of lowering ground rents, the source of income of the landed aristocracy. The latter naturally preferred to 'lower' grain prices by legislative means. One Corn Law was superseded by another, slightly modified. The futility of the law was explained each time as due to unessential details which a new Act of Parliament could correct. If thus the price of grain was maintained above the natural level under certain circumstances, the price of *ground rent* was kept above that level no matter what the circumstances. As the question here concerned 'the most sacred interests' of the landed aristocracy—its cash income—its two factions, Tories and Whigs, were equally willing to revere the 'Corn Laws' as fixed stars standing *above* their partisan struggle. The Whigs even resisted the temptation to entertain 'liberal views' on this subject, the more so since prospects at the time seemed remote of covering eventual deficits in ground rent by restoring to themselves the hereditary *rentes* obtained from government office. In order to secure the votes of the financial aristocracy both factions had voted for the Bank Law of 1819, under which interest on government debts contracted in depreciated currency had to be paid in undepreciated currency. The nation which had borrowed, say, £50 had to pay back £100. That is how the assent of the financial aristocracy to the Corn Laws was secured. Fraudulent increase of government *rentes* for fraudulent increase of ground rents—such was the bargain concluded between financial aristocracy and landed aristocracy."

<sup>9</sup> The German version adds here: "But what the state of emergency of the nation was unable to bring about was brought about by the state of emergency of the Cabinet."

cape their fate by a dissolution of Parliament. Then in the deep soul of Lord John awoke the idea of stultifying the anti-Corn Law agitation, as he had hoped to stultify the reform movement. He declared himself all at once in favor of a moderate fixed duty—friend of moderate political chastity and of moderate reforms as he is. He had even the effrontery to parade himself through the streets of London in a procession of the government candidates carrying banners, on which were exhibited in contrast two loaves, a loaf of a two-penny size inscribed the Peel Loaf, and a loaf of a 1s. size inscribed the Russell Loaf. The nation, however, knew from experience that the Whigs were wont to promise bread and to give stones, and, notwithstanding Russell's ridiculous street theatricals, the new election left the Whig cabinet in a minority of 76, and they were forced to decamp at last.

During the years 1841–45, the Anti-Corn-Law League became formidable.<sup>10</sup> In the autumn of 1845, it found new and terrible allies in the famine in Ireland, the corn dearth in England, and the failure of the harvest all over Europe. Sir Robert Peel therefore, at the end of October, and between the 1st and the 6th November, held a series of cabinet councils, in which he proposed the suspension of the Corn Laws, and even hinted at the necessity of repealing them altogether. A delay in the resolutions of the cabinet was caused by the unexpected resistance of Lord Stanley, the colleague of Sir Robert Peel. John Russell, then on a pleasure trip at Edinburgh, got scent of what passed in Peel's cabinet council. He resolved at once to improve the delay caused by Stan-

<sup>10</sup> The German version adds here: "The old compact between landed and financial aristocracy no longer guaranteed the Corn Laws, as the industrial bourgeoisie was displacing the financial aristocracy to an ever greater extent and becoming the leading part of the middle classes. But to the industrial bourgeoisie the abolition of the Corn Laws was a question of life and death. Lowering of production costs, expansion of foreign trade, increase in profits, lessening of the main source of income, and hence of power, of the landed aristocracy, enhancement of their own political power—such were the implications of the Corn Law repeal to the industrial bourgeoisie."

ley's opposition, to cheat Peel out of a popular position by anticipating him, to give himself the appearance of having forced free trade upon Peel, and thus deprive the acts of his rival of all their moral weight. Accordingly, on Nov. 22, 1845, he addressed from Edinburgh a letter to his city electors full of malignant imputations against Sir Robert Peel, on the pretext that the cabinet was adjourning its action concerning the Irish distress. The periodical Irish famines of 1831, '35, '37 and '39 had never induced Lord John and his colleagues so much as to reconsider the Corn Laws. But now he was all fire. Such a terrible disaster as the famine of two nations conjured nothing before the eyes of that little man but visions of claptraps against his rival placeholder. In his letter he tried to conceal the real motive of his sudden conversion to free trade under a shabby confession, sneered at in all England:

I confess that on the general subject my views have, in the course of twenty years, undergone a great alteration. I used to be of opinion that corn was an exception to the general rules of political economy, but observation and experience have convinced me that we ought to abstain from all interference with the supply of food.

In the same letter, the little man urged that it was the duty of Sir Robert Peel to interfere with the supply of food for Ireland.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The German version adds here: "Peel caught the little man in his own trap. He resigned, but left a note to the Queen in which he promised to support Russell if the latter should take over the task of having the Corn Laws repealed. The Queen summoned Russell and asked him to form a new cabinet. He came, saw and—declared himself *incapable* of doing so even with his rival's support. He had not expected this turn of events. To him it had been only a *false pretense* and now they were threatening to take him at his word! Peel returned to office and abolished the Corn Laws. His act crushed the Tory Party and broke it up. Russell entered into a bloc with it to bring about Peel's downfall. Such is his claim to the title of 'Free-Trade Minister,' of which he still boasted in Parliament but a few days ago."

Lord John Russell is supposed to have opened his career with efforts for religious tolerance, and closed it with the anti-popery cry. It is true that he brought forward in 1828 a motion for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts; but, as we learn from a contemporaneous author, "*to the astonishment* of the mover himself, the motion was carried by a majority of 44." The acts had, in fact, become a dead letter, and the Tory ministry that carried, in the year after, the Catholic Emancipation bill, was glad to get rid of the Dissenters' disabilities. Russell defended his measure on the ground that "he was fully convinced that it would tend to the security of the Church of England as by law established." When in office, he always opposed the separation of church and state—the great thing the Dissenters prayed for. He even opposed the small concession of abolishing the church rates. His anti-popery cry is still more characteristic of the shallowness of the man and the littleness of his motives. We have seen that in 1848 and 1849 he baffled the Reform motions of his own allies by the support of the Tories. His tenure of office, therefore, had become very precarious, because dependent on the sufferance of his opponents. Such was his position in 1850, at the time when the Pope's bull for the erection of a Roman Catholic hierarchy in England and the nomination of Cardinal Wiseman to the Archbishopric of Westminster was creating a factitious excitement among the shallow-headed, stupid, and hypocritical portion of the English people. As to John himself, the Pope did not take him by surprise. His father-in-law, Lord Minto, was still at Rome when the *Roman Gazette*, in January 1848, published the nomination of Wiseman to the archbishopric. We know further, from Wiseman's letter to the English people, that the same Lord Minto had in the same year shown to him by the Pope the bull for the establishment of the hierarchy in England. Under Russell's premiership Clarendon and Grey had officially given the Catholic bishops in Ireland and the colonies the titles they

pretended to. In 1845, when out of office, John Russell declared: "I believe that we may repeal those disallowing clauses which prevent a Roman Catholic bishop from assuming a title held by a bishop of the Establishment. Nothing can be more *absurd and puerile* than to keep such distinctions." But now, considering the weakness of his cabinet, recollecting that the Whig cabinet of 1807 had been expelled by the anti-popery cry, fearing lest Lord Stanley might be tempted to imitate Perceval's example and outgeneral him during the recess of Parliament, as he had endeavored to outgeneral Peel by his own Edinburgh letter, he flew suddenly into an unbounded Protestant passion, and addressed his scurrilous letter to the Bishop of Durham on the 4th November, 1850—just the day before the anniversary of Guy Fawkes. In this letter he tells the Bishop: "I agree with you in considering the late aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism as insolent and insidious, and I therefore feel as indignant as you can do upon the subject." He speaks of "the laborious endeavors which are now making to confine the intellect and enslave the soul." He calls the Catholic ceremonies "mummeries of superstition, upon which the great mass of the nation looks with contempt"; and he finally promises to enact new laws against the papal assumption, in case the old ones should not prove sufficient. In 1851 he brought forward his Ecclesiastical Titles bill; but, being beaten on Locke King's motion, by a combination of the Irish Brigade with the radicals, Manchester men, and Peelites, he recanted and promised an alteration of his bill, which died of consumption before it had come out of the House. Some months later, being ejected from office, he fawned again on what he had called the Pope's minions.

As his anti-popery zeal was a false pretense, so was his Jewish emancipation zeal. His Jewish Disabilities bill has obtained reputation as an annual farce enacted to secure to Lord John the city votes at the disposal of the Austrian

Baron Rothschild. His colonial reforms, educational schemes, antislavery moves, were false pretenses all. "Your opposition," writes Lord Brougham to him in 1839, "to all the motions in favor of the negroes, and your resistance even to the attempts for stopping the newly-established slave-trade, widened the breach between you and the country. The fancy that the opposers of all the motions on the slave-trade in 1838, the enemies of every interference with the Assemblies, should all of a sudden have become so enamored of the negro cause as almost to risk their tenure of place upon a bill for its furtherance in 1839, would argue a strange aptitude for being gulled." His legal reform attempts—false pretenses! After the expulsion of the Melbourne cabinet had become imminent, upon the vote of no confidence passed against them on June 4, 1841, John Russell endeavored to hurry through the House a Chancery bill, in order "to remedy one of the most urgent evils of our legal system, the delays in the Courts of Equity, by the creation of two new Equity Judges." He announced this bill as "a large instalment of legal reform." His real intention was to appoint two of his followers to places in a tribunal not yet created before the Tories had yet come in. Sir Edward Sugden, to ward him off, carried a motion that the bill should not take effect before the 10th of October. Although no change whatever was made in the substance of his large and most urgent legal reform installment, John Russell, without any kind of excuse, threw up the whole bill at once. His tenderness for the liberty of the subject, his belief in the public press, and, as we have lately seen and shown, his warlike enthusiasm and his peace-loving moderation—false pretenses, all!

The whole man is one false pretense, his whole life one great lie, his whole activity a chain of minute intrigues for shabby ends, the swallowing of the public money and the usurpation of the mere show of power. No other man has verified to such a degree the truth of the Biblical axiom that no man is able to add one inch to his natural height. Placed

by birth, connections, and social accidents on a colossal pedestal, he always remained the same *homunculus*—a malignant and distorted dwarf on the top of a pyramid. The history of the world exhibits, perhaps, no other man so great in littleness.

(Marx)

## **(China and Russia)**

---

*Not Dated / Published April 7, 1857*

In the matter of trade and intercourse with China, of which Lord Palmerston and Louis Napoleon have undertaken the extension by force, no little jealousy is evidently felt of the position occupied by Russia. Indeed, it is quite possible that without any expenditure of money or exertion of military force Russia may gain more in the end, as a consequence of the pending quarrel with the Chinese, than either of the belligerent nations.

The relations of Russia to the Chinese Empire are altogether peculiar. While the English and ourselves—for in the matter of the pending hostilities the French are but little more than amateurs, as they really have no trade with China—are not allowed the privilege of a direct communication even with the Viceroy of Canton, the Russians enjoy the ad-



vantage of maintaining an embassy at Peking. It is said, indeed, that this advantage is purchased only by submitting to allow Russia to be reckoned at the Celestial Court as one of the tributary dependencies of the Chinese Empire. Nevertheless it enables Russian diplomacy, as in Europe, to establish an influence for itself in China which is by no means limited to purely diplomatic operations. Being excluded from the maritime trade with China, the Russians are free from any interest or involvement in past or pending disputes on that subject; and they also escape that antipathy with which from time immemorial the Chinese have regarded all foreigners approaching their country by sea, confounding them, and not entirely without reason, with the piratical adventurers by whom the Chinese coasts seem ever to have been infested. But as an indemnity for this exclusion from the maritime trade, the Russians enjoy an inland and overland trade peculiar to themselves, and in which it seems impossible for them to have any rival. This traffic, regulated by a treaty made in 1787, during the reign of Catharine II, has for its principal, if not indeed its sole, seat of operations, Kiachta, situate on the frontiers of southern Siberia and of Chinese Tatar, on a tributary of the Lake Baikal, and about a hundred miles south of the city of Irkutsk. This trade, conducted at a sort of annual fair, is managed by twelve factors, of whom six are Russians and six Chinese, who meet at Kiachta and fix the rates—since the trade is entirely by barter—at which the merchandise supplied by either party shall be exchanged. The principal articles of trade are, on the part of the Chinese, tea, and on the part of the Russians, cotton and woollen cloths. This trade, of late years, seems to have attained a considerable increase. The quantity of tea sold to the Russians at Kiachta did not, ten or twelve years ago, exceed an average of forty thousand chests; but in 1852 it amounted to a hundred and seventy-five thousand chests, of which the larger part was of that superior quality well known to Continental consumers as caravan tea, in contradistinction from the in-

ferior article imported by sea. The other articles sold by the Chinese were some small quantities of sugar, cotton, raw silk, and silk goods, but all to very limited amounts. The Russians paid about equally in cotton and woollen goods, with the addition of small quantities of Russian leather, wrought metals, furs, and even opium. The whole amount of goods bought and sold—which seem in the published accounts to be stated at very moderate prices—reached the large sum of upward of fifteen millions of dollars. In 1853, owing to the internal troubles of China and the occupation of the road from the tea provinces by bands of marauding rebels, the quantity of tea sent to Kiachta fell off to fifty thousand chests, and the whole value of the trade of that year was but about six millions of dollars. In the two following years, however, this commerce revived, and the tea sent to Kiachta for the fair of 1855 did not fall short of a hundred and twelve thousand chests.

In consequence of the increase of this trade, Kiachta, which is situated within the Russian frontier, from a mere fort and fairground, has grown up into a considerable city. It has been selected as the capital of that part of the frontier region, and is to be dignified by having a military commandant and a civil governor. At the same time a direct and regular postal communication for the transmission of official dispatches has lately been established between Kiachta and Peking, which is distant from it about nine hundred miles.

It is evident that, should the pending hostilities result in a suppression of the maritime trade, Europe might receive its entire supply of tea by this route. Indeed, it is suggested that even with the maritime trade open, Russia may, upon the completion of her system of railroads, become a powerful competitor with the maritime nations for supplying the European markets with tea. These railroads will supply a direct communication between the ports of Kronstadt and Libau and the ancient city of Nizhni Novgorod in the interior of Russia, the residence of the merchants by whom the trade at

Kiachta is carried on. The supply of Europe with tea by this overland route is certainly more probable than the employment of our projected Pacific railroad for that purpose. Silk, too, the other chief export of China, is an article of such small bulk in comparison to its cost as to make its transportation by land by no means impossible, while this Chinese traffic opens an outlet for Russian manufactures, such as they cannot elsewhere attain.

We may observe, however, that the efforts of Russia are by no means limited to the development of this inland trade. It is several years since she took possession of the banks of the River Amur, the native country of the present ruling race in China. Her efforts in this direction received some check and interruption during the late war, but will doubtless be revived and pushed with energy. She has possession of the Kurile Islands and the neighboring coasts of Kamchatka. Already she maintains a fleet in those seas, and will doubtless improve any opportunity that may offer to obtain a participation in the maritime trade with China. This, however, is of little consequence to her compared with the extension of that overland trade of which she possesses the monopoly.

(Marx)

## **(Torture as a Financial Institution in British India)**

---

*Not Dated / Published September 17, 1857*

Our London correspondent, whose letter with regard to the Indian revolt we published yesterday, very properly referred to some of the antecedents which prepared the way for this violent outbreak. We propose today to devote a moment to continuing that line of reflections, and to showing that the British rulers of India are by no means such mild and spotless benefactors of the Indian people as they would have the world believe. For this purpose, we shall resort to the official Blue Books on the subject of East Indian torture, which were laid before the House of Commons during the sessions of 1856 and 1857. The evidence, it will be seen, is of a sort which cannot be gainsaid.

We have first the report of the Torture Commission at Madras, which states its "belief in the general existence of

torture for revenue purposes." It doubts whether "anything like an equal number of persons is annually subjected to violence on criminal charges, as for the fault of non-payment of revenue." It declares that there was "one thing which had impressed the Commission even more painfully than the conviction that torture exists; it is the difficulty of obtaining redress which confronts the injured parties."

The reasons for this difficulty given by the commissioners are: 1. The distances which those who wish to make complaints personally to the collector have to travel, involving expense and loss of time in attending upon his office; 2. The fear that applications by letter "will be returned with the ordinary indorsement of a reference to the tahsildar," the district police and revenue officer—that is, to the very man who, either in his person or through his petty police subordinates, has wronged him; 3. The inefficient means of procedure and punishment provided by law for officers of government, even when formally accused or convicted of these practices. It seems that if a charge of this nature were proved before a magistrate, he could only punish by a fine of fifty rupees, or a month's imprisonment. The alternative consisted of handing over the accused "to the criminal judge to be punished by him, or committed for trial before the Court of the Circuit."

The report adds that "these seem to be tedious proceedings, applicable only to one class of offenses, abuse of authority—namely, in police charges, and totally inadequate to the necessities of the case."

A police or revenue officer, who is the same person, as the revenue is collected by the police, when charged with extorting money, is first tried by the assistant collector; he then can appeal to the collector; then to the Revenue Board. This board may refer him to the government or to the civil courts.

In such a state of the law, no poverty-stricken ryot could contend against any wealthy revenue officer; and we are not

aware of any complaints having been brought forward under these two regulations (of 1822 and 1828) by the people.

Further, this extorting of money applies only to taking the public money, or forcing a further contribution from the ryot for the officer to put into his own pocket. There is, therefore, no legal means of punishment whatever for the employment of force in collecting the public revenue.

The report from which these quotations are made applies only to the Presidency of Madras; but Lord Dalhousie himself, writing in September 1855, to the directors, says that "he has long ceased to doubt that torture in one shape or other is practised by the lower subordinates in every British province."

The universal existence of torture as a financial institution of British India is thus officially admitted, but the admission is made in such a manner as to shield the British government itself. In fact, the conclusion arrived at by the Madras Commission is that the practice of torture is entirely the fault of the lower Hindu officials, while the European servants of the government had always, however unsuccessfully, done their best to prevent it. In answer to this assertion, the Madras Native Association presented, in January 1856, a petition to Parliament, complaining of the torture investigation on the following grounds: 1. That there was scarcely any investigation at all, the commission sitting only in the city of Madras, and for but three months, while it was impossible, except in very few cases, for the natives who had complaints to make to leave their homes; 2. That the commissioners did not endeavor to trace the evil to its source; had they done so, it would have been discovered to be in the very system of collecting the revenue; 3. That no inquiry was made of the accused native officials as to what extent their superiors were acquainted with the practice. "The origin of this coercion," say the petitioners, "is not with the physical perpetrators of it, but descends to them from the officials immediately their su-

periors, which latter again are answerable for the estimated amount of the collection to their European superiors, these also being responsible on the same head to the highest authority of the Government."

Indeed, a few extracts from the evidence on which the Madras Report professes to be founded will suffice to refute its assertion that "no blame is due to Englishmen." Thus, Mr. W. D. Kohlhoff, a merchant, says:

The modes of torture practised are various, and suitable to the fancy of the tahsildar or his subordinates, but whether any redress is received from higher authorities, it is difficult for me to tell, *as all complaints are generally referred to the tahsildars* for investigation and information.

Among the cases of complaint from natives, we find the following:

Last year, as our peasanum (principal paddy or rice crops) failed for want of rain, we were unable to pay as usual. When the jamabandi was made we claimed a remission on account of the losses, according to the terms of the agreement entered into in 1837, by us, when Mr. Eden was our collector. As this remission was not allowed, we refused to take our puttahs. The tahsildar then commenced to compel us to pay with great severity, from the month of June to August. I and others were placed in charge of persons who used to take us in the sun. There we were made to stoop and stones were put on our backs, and we were kept in the burning sand. After 8 o'clock, we were let to go to our rice. Such like ill treatment was continued during three months, during which we sometimes went to give our petitions to the collector, who refused to take them. We took these petitions and appealed to the Sessions Court, who transmitted them to the collector. Still we got no justice. In the month of September, a notice was served upon us, and twenty-five days after, our property was distrained, and afterward sold. Besides what I have mentioned, our women were also ill treated; the kittee was put upon their breasts.

A native Christian states in reply to questions put by the commissioners:

When a European or native regiment passes through, all the ryots are pressed to bring in provisions, etc., *for nothing*, and should any of them ask for the price of the articles, they are severely tortured.

There follows the case of a Brahman, in which he, with others of his own village and of the neighboring villages, was called on by the tahsildars to furnish planks, charcoal, firewood, etc., gratis, that they might carry on the Coleroon bridgework; on refusing, he is seized by twelve men and maltreated in various ways. He adds:

I presented a complaint to the Sub-Collector, Mr. W. Cadell, but he made no inquiry, and tore my complaint. As he is desirous of completing cheaply the Coleroon bridge-work at the expense of the poor and of acquiring a good name from the Government, whatever may be the nature of the murder committed by the tahsildar, he takes no cognizance of it.

The light in which illegal practices, carried to the last degree of extortion and violence, were looked upon by the highest authority is best shown by the case of Mr. Brereton, the Commissioner in charge of the Ludhiana District in the Punjab in 1855. According to the Report of the Chief Commissioner for the Punjab, it was proved that

in matters under the immediate cognizance or direction of the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Brereton himself, the houses of wealthy citizens had been causelessly searched; that property seized on such occasions was detained for lengthened periods; that many parties were thrown into prison, and lay there for weeks, without charges being exhibited against them; and that the laws relating to security for bad character had been applied with sweeping and indiscriminating severity. That the Deputy



Commissioner had been followed about from district to district by certain police officers and informers, whom he employed wherever he went, and that these men had been the main authors of mischief.

In his minute on the case, Lord Dalhousie says:

We have irrefragable proof—proof, indeed, undisputed by Mr. Brereton himself—that that officer has been guilty of each item in the heavy catalogue of irregularities and illegalities with which the Chief Commissioner has charged him, and which have brought disgrace on one portion of the British administration, and have subjected a large number of British subjects to gross injustice, to arbitrary imprisonment and cruel torture.

Lord Dalhousie proposes “to make a great public example,” and, consequently, is of opinion that

Mr. Brereton cannot, *for the present*, be fitly intrusted with the authority of a Deputy Commissioner, but ought to be removed from that grade to the grade of a first class Assistant.

These extracts from the Blue Books may be concluded with the petition from the inhabitants of Talook in Canara, on the Malabar coast, who, after stating that they had presented several petitions to the government to no purpose, thus contrast their former and present condition:

While we were cultivating wet and dry lands, hill tracts, low tracts and forests, paying the light assessment fixed upon us, and thereby enjoying tranquillity and happiness under the administration of “Ranee,” Bahadur and Tippoo, the then Circar servants, levied an additional assessment, but we never paid it. We were not subjected to privations, oppressions or ill-usages in collecting the revenue. On the surrender of this country to the Honourable Company, they devised all sorts of plans to squeeze out money from us. With this pernicious object in

view, they invented rules and framed regulations, and directed their collectors and civil judges to put them in execution. But the then collectors and their subordinate native officials paid for some time due attention to our grievances, and acted in consonance with our wishes. On the contrary, the present collectors and their subordinate officials, *desirous of obtaining promotion on any account whatever*, neglect the welfare and interests of the people in general, turn a deaf ear to our grievances, and subject us to all sorts of oppressions.

We have here given but a brief and mildly colored chapter from the real history of British rule in India. In view of such facts, dispassionate and thoughtful men may perhaps be led to ask whether a people are not justified in attempting to expel the foreign conquerors who have so abused their subjects. And if the English could do these things in cold blood, is it surprising that the insurgent Hindus should be guilty, in the fury of revolt and conflict, of the crimes and cruelties alleged against them?

(Marx)

## **(British Income from India)**

---

*Not Dated / Published September 21, 1857*

The present state of affairs in Asia suggests the inquiry, What is the real value of their Indian dominion to the British nation and people? Directly, that is in the shape of tribute, or surplus of Indian receipts over Indian expenditures, nothing whatever reaches the British treasury. On the contrary, the annual outgo is very large. From the moment that the East India Company entered extensively on the career of conquest—now just about a century ago—their finances fell into an embarrassed condition, and they were repeatedly compelled to apply to Parliament, not only for military aid to assist them in holding the conquered territories, but for financial aid to save them from bankruptcy. And so things have continued down to the present moment, at which so large a call is made for troops on the British nation, to be

followed, no doubt, by corresponding calls for money. In prosecuting its conquests hitherto, and building up its establishments, the East India Company has contracted a debt of upward of £50,000,000 sterling, while the British government has been at the expense, for years past, of transporting to and from and keeping up in India, in addition to the forces, native and European, of the East India Company, a standing army of thirty thousand men. Such being the case, it is evident that the advantage to Great Britain from her Indian Empire must be limited to the profits and benefits which accrue to individual British subjects. These profits and benefits, it must be confessed, are very considerable.

First, we have the stockholders in the East India Company, to the number of about 3,000 persons, to whom under the recent charter<sup>1</sup> there is guaranteed, upon a paid-up capital of six millions of pounds sterling, an annual dividend of ten and a half per cent, amounting to £630,000 annually. As the East India stock is held in transferable shares, anybody may become a stockholder who has money enough to buy the stock, which, under the existing charter, commands a premium of from 125 to 150 per cent. Stock to the amount of £500, costing say \$6,000, entitles the holder to speak at the proprietors' meetings, but to vote he must have £1,000 of stock. Holders of £3,000 have two votes, of £6,000 three votes, and of £10,000 or upward four votes. The proprietors, however, have but little voice, except in the election of the Board of Directors, of whom they choose twelve, while the Crown appoints six; but these appointees of the Crown must be qualified by having resided for ten years or more in India. One-third of the directors go out of office each year, but may be reelected or reappointed. To be a director, one must be a proprietor of £2,000 of stock. The directors have a salary of £500 each, and their chairman and deputy chairman twice as much; but the chief inducement to accept the office is

<sup>1</sup> The East India Company Charter of 1853.

the great patronage attached to it in the appointment of all Indian officers, civil and military—a patronage, however, largely shared, and, as to the most important offices, engrossed substantially, by the Board of Control. This board consists of six members, all privy councilors, and in general two or three of them cabinet ministers—the president of the board being always so, in fact a Secretary of State for India.

Next come the recipients of this patronage, divided into five classes—civil, clerical, medical, military, and naval. For service in India, at least in the civil line, some knowledge of the languages spoken there is necessary, and to prepare young men to enter their civil service, the East India Company has a college at Haileybury. A corresponding college for the military service, in which, however, the rudiments of military science are the principal branches taught, has been established at Addiscombe, near London. Admission to these colleges was formerly a matter of favor on the part of the directors of the company, but under the latest modifications of the charter it has been opened to competition in the way of a public examination of candidates. On first reaching India, a civilian is allowed about \$150 a month, till having passed a necessary examination in one or more of the native languages (which must be within twelve months after his arrival), he is attached to the service with emoluments which vary from \$2,500 to near \$50,000 per annum. The latter is the pay of the members of the Bengal Council; the members of the Bombay and Madras Councils receive about \$30,000 per annum. No person not a member of council can receive more than about \$25,000 per annum, and, to obtain an appointment worth \$20,000 or over he must have been a resident in India for twelve years. Nine years' residence qualifies for salaries of from \$15,000 to \$20,000, and three years' residence for salaries of from \$7,000 to \$15,000. Appointments in the civil service go nominally by seniority and merit, but really to a great extent by favor. As they are the

best paid, there is great competition to get them, the military officers leaving their regiments for this purpose whenever they can get a chance. The average of all the salaries in the civil service is stated at about \$8,000, but this does not include perquisites and extra allowances, which are often very considerable. These civil servants are employed as governors, councilors, judges, ambassadors, secretaries, collectors of the revenue, etc.—the number in the whole being generally about 800. The salary of the Governor-General of India is \$125,000, but the extra allowances often amount to a still larger sum. The Church service includes three bishops and about one hundred and sixty chaplains. The bishop of Calcutta has \$25,000 a year; those of Madras and Bombay half as much; the chaplains from \$2,500 to \$7,000, besides fees. The medical service includes some 800 physicians and surgeons, with salaries of from \$1,500 to \$10,000.

The European military officers employed in India, including those of the contingents which the dependent princes are obliged to furnish, number about 8,000. The fixed pay in the infantry is, for ensigns, \$1,080; lieutenants, \$1,344; captains, \$2,226; majors, \$3,810; lieutenant-colonels, \$5,520; colonels, \$7,680. This is the pay in cantonment. In active service, it is more. The pay in the cavalry, artillery, and engineers is somewhat higher. By obtaining staff situations or employments in the civil service, many officers double their pay.

Here are about ten thousand British subjects holding lucrative situations in India, and drawing their pay from the Indian service. To these must be added a considerable number living in England, whither they have retired upon pensions, which in all the services are payable after serving a certain number of years. These pensions, with the dividends and interest on debts due in England, consume some fifteen to twenty millions of dollars drawn annually from India, and which may in fact be regarded as so much tribute paid to the English government indirectly through its subjects. Those who annually retire from the several services carry with

them very considerable amounts of savings from their salaries, which is so much more added to the annual drain on India.

Besides those Europeans actually employed in the service of the government, there are other European residents in India to the number of 6,000 or more, employed in trade or private speculation. Except a few indigo, sugar, and coffee planters in the rural districts, they are principally merchants, agents, and manufacturers, who reside in the cities of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras, or their immediate vicinity. The foreign trade of India, including imports and exports to the amount of about fifty millions of dollars of each, is almost entirely in their hands, and their profits are no doubt very considerable.

It is thus evident that individuals gain largely by the English connection with India, and of course their gain goes to increase the sum of the national wealth. But against all this a very large offset is to be made. The military and naval expenses paid out of the pockets of the people of England on Indian account have been constantly increasing with the extent of the Indian dominion. To this must be added the expense of Burmese, Afghan, Chinese and Persian wars. In fact, the whole cost of the late Russian war may fairly be charged to the Indian account, since the fear and dread of Russia, which led to that war, grew entirely out of jealousy as to her designs on India. Add to this the career of endless conquest and perpetual aggression in which the English are involved by the possession of India, and it may well be doubted whether, on the whole, this dominion does not threaten to cost quite as much as it can ever be expected to come to.

(Marx)

# **The Approaching Indian Loan**

---

*Dated January 22, 1858 / Published February 9, 1858*

The buoyancy in the London money market, resulting from the withdrawal of an enormous mass of capital from the ordinary productive investments, and its consequent transfer to the security markets, has, in the last fortnight, been somewhat lessened by the prospects of an impending *Indian loan* to the amount of eight or ten million pounds sterling. This loan, to be raised in England, and to be authorized by Parliament immediately on its assembling in February, is required to meet the claims upon the East India Company by its home creditors, as well as the extra expenditure for war materials, stores, transport of troops, etc., necessitated by the Indian revolt. In August 1857, the British government had, before the prorogation of Parliament, solemnly declared in the House of Commons that no such loan was intended, the



financial resources of the company being more than sufficient to meet the crisis. The agreeable delusion thus palmed on John Bull was, however, soon dispelled when it oozed out that, by a proceeding of a very questionable character, the East India Company had laid hold on a sum of about £3,500,000 sterling, intrusted to them by different companies, for the construction of Indian railways; and had, moreover, secretly borrowed £1,000,000 sterling from the Bank of England, and another million from the London joint-stock banks. The public being thus prepared for the worst, the government did no longer hesitate to drop the mask, and by semiofficial articles in *The Times*, *Globe*, and other governmental organs, avow the necessity of the loan.

It may be asked why a special act on the part of the legislative power is required for launching such a loan, and then, why such an event does create the least apprehension, since, on the contrary, every vent for British capital, seeking now in vain for profitable investment, should, under present circumstances, be considered a windfall, and a most salutary check upon the rapid depreciation of capital.

It is generally known that the commercial existence of the East India Company was terminated in 1834,<sup>1</sup> when its principal remaining source of commercial profits, the monopoly of the China trade, was cut off. Consequently, the holders of East India stock having derived their dividends, nominally, at least, from the trade profits of the company, a new financial arrangement with regard to them had become necessary. The payment of the dividends, till then chargeable upon the commercial revenue of the company, was transferred to its political revenue. The proprietors of East India stocks were to be paid out of the revenues enjoyed by the East India Company in its governmental capacity, and, by act of Parliament, the Indian stock, amounting to £6,000,000 ster-

<sup>1</sup> An Act of Parliament of 1833 deprived the Company of its trading monopoly in China and abolished it as a trading agency. Its administrative functions remained, however, and its Charter was extended to 1853.

ling, bearing ten per cent interest, was converted into a capital not to be liquidated except at the rate of £200 for every £100 of stock. In other words, the original East India stock of £6,000,000 sterling was converted into a capital of £12,000,000 sterling, bearing five per cent interest, and chargeable upon the revenue derived from the taxes of the Indian people. The debt of the East India Company was thus, by a parliamentary sleight of hand, changed into a debt of the Indian people. There exists, besides, a debt exceeding £50,000,000 sterling, contracted by the East India Company in India, and exclusively chargeable upon the state revenues of that country; such loans contracted by the company in India itself having always been considered to lie beyond the district of parliamentary legislation, and regarded no more than the debts contracted by the colonial governments in Canada or Australia, for instance.

On the other hand, the East India Company was prohibited from contracting interest-bearing debts in Great Britain herself, without the especial sanction of Parliament. Some years ago, when the company set about establishing railways and electric telegraphs in India, it applied for the authorization of Indian bonds in the London market, a request which was granted to the amount of £7,000,000 sterling, to be issued in bonds bearing 4 per cent interest, and secured only on the Indian state revenues. At the commencement of the outbreak in India, this bond debt stood at £3,894,400 sterling, and the very necessity of again applying to Parliament shows the East India Company to have, during the course of the Indian insurrection, exhausted its legal powers of borrowing at home.

Now it is no secret that before recurring to this step the East India Company had opened a loan at Calcutta, which, however, turned out a complete failure. This proves, on the one hand, that Indian capitalists are far from considering the prospects of British supremacy in India in the same sanguine spirit which distinguishes the London press; and, on the

other hand, exacerbates the feelings of John Bull to an uncommon pitch, since he is aware of the immense hoardings of capital having gone on for the last seven years in India, whither, according to a statement recently published by Messrs. Haggard & Pixley, there has been shipped in 1856 and 1857, from the port of London alone, bullion to the amount of £21,000,000. The *London Times*, in a most persuasive strain, has taught its readers that

of all the incentives to the loyalty of the natives, that of making them our creditors was the least doubtful; while, on the other hand, among an impulsive, secretive and avaricious people no temptation to discontent or treachery could be stronger than that created by the idea that they were annually taxed to send dividends to wealthy claimants in other countries.

The Indians, however, appear not to understand the beauty of a plan which would not only restore English supremacy at the expense of Indian capital, but at the same time, in a circuitous way, open the native hoards to British commerce. If, indeed, the Indian capitalists were as fond of British rule as every true Englishman thinks it an article of faith to assert, no better opportunity could have been afforded them of exhibiting their loyalty and getting rid of their silver. The Indian capitalists shutting up their hoards, John Bull must open his mind to the dire necessity of defraying himself in the first instance, at least, the expenses of the Indian insurrection, without any support on the part of the natives. The impending loan constitutes, moreover, a precedent only, and looks like the first leaf in a book, bearing the title, *Anglo-Indian Home Debt*. It is no secret that what the East India Company wants are not eight millions, or ten millions, but twenty-five to thirty millions pounds, and even these as a first installment only, not for expenses to be incurred, but for debts already due. The deficient revenue for the last three years amounted to £5,000,000; the treasure

plundered by the insurgents up to the 15th October last, to £10,000,000, according to the statement of *The Phoenix*, an Indian governmental paper; the loss of revenue in the north-eastern provinces, consequent upon the rebellion, to £5,000,000; and the war expenses to at least £10,000,000.

It is true that successive loans by the Indian Company in the London money market would raise the value of money and prevent the increasing depreciation of capital, that is to say, the further fall in the rate of interest; but such a fall is exactly required for the revival of British industry and commerce. Any artificial check put upon the downward movement of the rate of discount is equivalent to an enhancement in the cost of production and the terms of credit, which, in its present weak state, English trade feels itself unable to bear. Hence the general cry of distress at the announcement of the Indian loan. Though the parliamentary sanction adds no imperial guarantee to the loan of the company, that guarantee, too, must be conceded, if money is not to be obtained on other terms; and despite all fine distinctions, as soon as the East India Company is supplanted by the British government its debt will be merged into the British debt. A further increase of the large national debt seems, therefore, one of the first financial consequences of the Indian revolt.

(Marx)

# The Indian Bill

---

*Not Dated / Published July 24, 1858*

The latest Indian bill has passed through its third reading in the House of Commons, and since the Lords, swayed by Derby's influence, are not likely to show fight, the doom of the East India Company appears to be sealed. They do not die like heroes, it must be confessed; but they have bartered away their power, as they crept into it, bit by bit, in a businesslike way. In fact, their whole history is one of buying and selling. They commenced by buying sovereignty, and they have ended by selling it. *They have fallen*, not in a pitched battle, but under the hammer of the auctioneer, into the hands of the highest bidder. In 1693 they procured from the Crown a charter for twenty-one years by paying large sums to the Duke of Leeds and other public officers. In 1767 they prolonged their tenure of power for two years by the promise

of annually paying £400,000 into the imperial exchequer. In 1769 they struck a similar bargain for five years; but soon after, in return for the Exchequer's forgoing the stipulated annual payment and lending them £1,400,000 at 4 per cent, they alienated some parcels of sovereignty, leaving to Parliament in the first instance the nomination of the Governor-General and four councilors, altogether surrendering to the Crown the appointment of the Lord Chief Justice and his three judges, and agreeing to the conversion of the Court of Proprietors from a democratic into an oligarchic body.<sup>1</sup> In 1858, after having solemnly pledged themselves to the Court of Proprietors to resist by all constitutional "means" the transfer to the Crown of the governing powers of the East India Company, they have accepted that principle, and agreed to a bill penal as regards the Company, but securing emolument and place to its principal directors. If the death of a hero, as Schiller says, resembles the setting of the sun, the exit of the East India Company bears more likeness to the compromise effected by a bankrupt with his creditors.

By this bill the principal functions of administration are intrusted to a Secretary of State in Council, just as at Calcutta the Governor-General in Council manages affairs. But both these functionaries—the Secretary of State in England and the Governor-General in India—are alike authorized to disregard the advice of their assessors and to act upon their own judgment. The new bill also invests the Secretary of State with all the powers at present exercised by the President of the Board of Control, through the agency of the secret committee—the power, that is, in urgent cases, of dispatching orders to India without stopping to ask the advice of his council. In constituting that council it has been found necessary, after all, to resort to the East India Company as the only practicable source of appointments to it other than nominations by the Crown. The elective members of the

<sup>1</sup> By the Regulating Act of 1773.

council are to be elected by the directors of the East India Company from among their own number.

Thus, after all, the name of the East India Company is to outlive its substance. At the last hour it was confessed by the Derby cabinet that their bill contains no clause abolishing the East India Company, as represented by a Court of Directors, but that it becomes reduced to its ancient character of a company of stockholders, distributing the dividends guaranteed by different acts of legislation. Pitt's bill of 1784 virtually subjected their government to the sway of the cabinet under the name of the Board of Control. The act of 1813 stripped them of their monopoly of commerce, save the trade with China. The act of 1834 destroyed their commercial character altogether, and the act of 1854 annihilated their last remnant of power, still leaving them in possession of the Indian administration. By the rotation of history the East India Company, converted in 1612 into a joint-stock company, is again clothed in its primitive garb, only that it represents now a trading partnership without trade, and a joint-stock company which has no funds to administer, but only fixed dividends to draw.

The history of the Indian bill is marked by greater dramatic changes than any other act of modern parliamentary legislation. When the Sepoy Insurrection broke out, the cry of Indian reform rang through all classes of British society. Popular imagination was heated by the torture reports; the government interference with the native religion was loudly denounced by Indian general officers and civilians of high standing; the rapacious annexation policy of Lord Dalhousie, the mere tool of Downing Street; the fermentation recklessly created in the Asiatic mind by the piratical wars in Persia and China—wars commenced and pursued on Palmerston's private dictation—the weak measures with which he met the outbreak, sailing ships being chosen for transport in preference to steam vessels, and the circuitous navigation around

the Cape of Good Hope instead of transportation over the Isthmus of Suez—all these accumulated grievances burst into the cry for Indian reform—reform of the company's Indian administration, reform of the government's Indian policy. Palmerston caught at the popular cry, but resolved upon turning it to his exclusive profit. Because both the government and the company had miserably broken down, the company was to be killed in sacrifice, and the government to be rendered omnipotent. The power of the company was to be simply transferred to the dictator of the day, pretending to represent the Crown as against the Parliament, and to represent Parliament as against the Crown, thus absorbing the privileges of the one and the other in his single person. With the Indian army at his back, the Indian treasury at his command, and the Indian patronage in his pocket, Palmerston's position would have become impregnable.

His bill passed triumphantly through the first reading, but his career was cut short by the famous Conspiracy Bill,<sup>2</sup> followed by the advent of the Tories to power.

On the very first day of their official reappearance on the Treasury benches, they declared that, out of deference for the decisive will of the Commons, they would forsake their opposition to the transfer from the company to the Crown of the Indian government. Lord Ellenborough's legislative abortion<sup>3</sup> seemed to hasten Palmerston's restoration, when Lord John Russell, in order to force the dictator into a compromise, stepped in and saved the government by proposing to proceed with the Indian bill by way of parliamentary resolution, instead of by a governmental bill. Then Lord Ellenborough's Oudh dispatch, his sudden resignation, and the consequent disorganization in the ministerial camp, were ea-

<sup>2</sup> This Bill, proposed by Palmerston on February 8, 1858, was designed to prevent the plotting in England of assassinations to be carried out in *any* country. Its rejection by the House of Commons led to Palmerston's resignation.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Ellenborough's reform bill to improve the government of India was rejected; the rejection weakened the position of Lord Derby's government.



gerly seized upon by Palmerston. The Tories were again to be planted in the cold shade of opposition, after they had employed their short lease of power in breaking down the opposition of their own party against the confiscation of the East India Company. Yet it is sufficiently known how these fine calculations were baffled. Instead of rising on the ruins of the East India Company, Palmerston has been buried beneath them. During the whole of the Indian debates, the House seemed to indulge the peculiar satisfaction of humiliating the *Civis Romanus*.<sup>4</sup> All his amendments, great and small, were ignominiously lost; allusions of the most unsavory kind, relating to the Afghan war, the Persian war, and the Chinese war, were continually flung at his head; and Mr. Gladstone's clause, withdrawing from the Indian minister the power of originating wars beyond the boundaries of India, intended as a general vote of censure on Palmerston's past foreign policy, was passed by a crushing majority, despite his furious resistance. But although the man has been thrown overboard, his principle, upon the whole, has been accepted. Although somewhat checked by the obstructive attributes of the Board of Council, which, in fact, is but the well-paid specter of the old Court of Directors, the power of the executive has, by the formal annexation of India, been raised to such a degree that, to counterpoise it, democratic weight must be thrown into the parliamentary scale.

(Marx)

<sup>4</sup> *Civis Romanus sum* became Palmerston's nickname when, in the Don Pacifico affair, he asserted his determination to protect the rights of British subjects wherever they might be.

## Opium or Commerce?

---

*Not Dated / Published September 20, 1858*

The news of the new treaty wrung from China by the allied plenipotentiaries<sup>1</sup> has, it would appear, conjured up the same wild vistas of an immense extension of trade which danced before the eyes of the commercial mind in 1845, after the conclusion of the first Chinese war. Supposing the Petersburg wires to have spoken truth, is it quite certain that an increase of the Chinese trade must follow upon the multiplication of its emporiums? Is there any probability that the war of 1857-58 will lead to more splendid results than the war of 1839-42? So much is certain, that the treaty of 1842, instead of increasing American and English exports to China, proved instrumental only in precipitating and aggravating

<sup>1</sup> The Treaty of Tientsin, June 1, 1858. When Marx wrote, news of the treaty had reached London, but its details were not known.

the commercial crisis of 1847. In a similar way, by raising dreams of an inexhaustible market and by fostering false speculations, the present treaty may help preparing a new crisis at the very moment when the market of the world is but slowly recovering from the recent universal shock. Besides its negative result, the First Opium War succeeded in stimulating the opium trade at the expense of legitimate commerce, and so will this Second Opium War do if England be not forced by the general pressure of the civilized world to abandon the compulsory opium cultivation in India and the armed opium propaganda to China. We forbear dwelling on the morality of that trade, described by Montgomery Martin, himself an Englishman, in the following terms:

Why, the slave trade was merciful compared with the opium trade. We did not destroy the bodies of the Africans, for it was our immediate interest to keep them alive; we did not debase their natures, corrupt their minds, nor destroy their souls. But the opium seller slays the body after he has corrupted, degraded and annihilated the moral being of unhappy sinners, while every hour is bringing new victims to a Moloch which knows no satiety, and where the English murderer and Chinese suicide vie with each other in offerings at his shrine.

The Chinese cannot take both goods and drug; under actual circumstances, extension of the Chinese trade resolves into extension of the opium trade; the growth of the latter is incompatible with the development of legitimate commerce—these propositions were pretty generally admitted two years ago. A committee of the House of Commons, appointed in 1847 to take into consideration the state of British commercial intercourse with China, reported thus:

We regret that the trade with that country has been for some time in a very unsatisfactory condition, and that the *result of our extended intercourse has by no means realized the just expectations* which had naturally been founded in a *free access*

*to so magnificent a market.* We find that the difficulties of the trade do not arise from any want of demand in China for articles of British manufacture or from the increasing competition of other nations; *the payment for opium* absorbs the silver to the great inconvenience of the general traffic of the Chinese; and tea and silk must in fact pay the rest.

*The Friend of China*, of July 28, 1849, generalizing the same proposition, says in set terms:

The opium trade progresses steadily. The increased consumption of teas and silk in Great Britain and the United States would merely result in the increase of the opium trade; the case of the manufacturers is hopeless.

One of the leading American merchants in China reduced, in an article inserted in Hunt's *Merchants' Magazine*, for January 1850, the whole question of the trade with China to this point: "Which branch of commerce is to be suppressed, the opium trade or the export trade of American or English produce?" The Chinese themselves took exactly the same view of the case. Montgomery Martin narrates:

I inquired of the Taoutai at Shanghai which would be the best means of increasing our commerce with China, and his first answer to me, in the presence of Capt. Balfour, Her Majesty's Consul, was: "Cease to send us so much opium, and we will be able to take your manufactures."

The history of general commerce during the last eight years has, in a new and striking manner, illustrated these positions; but, before analyzing the deleterious effects on legitimate commerce of the opium trade, we propose giving a short review of the rise and progress of that stupendous traffic which, whether we regard the tragical collisions forming, so to say, the axis round which it turns, or the effects produced by it on the general relations of the Eastern and

Western worlds, stands solitary on record in the annals of mankind. Previous to 1767 the quantity of opium exported from India did not exceed 200 chests, the chest weighing about 133 lbs. Opium was legally admitted in China on the payment of a duty of about \$3 per chest, as a medicine, the Portuguese, who brought it from Turkey, being its almost exclusive importers into the Celestial Empire. In 1773, Colonel Watson and Vice-President Wheeler—persons deserving to take a place among the Hermentiers, Palmers, and other poisoners of world-wide fame—suggested to the East India Company the idea of entering upon the opium traffic with China. Consequently, there was established a depot for opium in vessels anchored in a bay to the southwest of Macao. The speculation proved a failure. In 1781 the Bengal government sent an armed vessel, laden with opium, to China; and, in 1794, the company stationed a large opium vessel at Whampoa, the anchorage for the port of Canton. It seems that Whampoa proved a more convenient depot than Macao, because, only two years after its selection, the Chinese government found it necessary to pass a law which threatened Chinese smugglers of opium to be beaten with a bamboo and exposed in the streets with wooden collars around their necks. About 1798, the East India Company ceased to be direct exporters of opium, but they became its producers. The opium monopoly was established in India; while the company's own ships were hypocritically forbidden from trafficking in the drug, the licenses it granted for private ships trading to China contained a provision which attached a penalty to them if freighted with opium of other than the company's own make. In 1800, the import into China had reached the number of 2,000 chests. Having, during the eighteenth century, borne the aspect common to all feuds between the foreign merchant and the national custom-house, the struggle between the East India Company and the Celestial Empire assumed, since the beginning of the nineteenth century, features quite distinct and exceptional; while

the Chinese Emperor, in order to check the suicide of his people, prohibited at once the import of the poison by the foreigner, and its consumption by the natives, the East India Company was rapidly converting the cultivation of opium in India, and its contraband sale to China, into internal parts of its own financial system. While the semibarbarian stood on the principle of morality, the civilized opposed to him the principle of self. That a giant empire, containing almost one-third of the human race, vegetating to the teeth of time, insulated by the forced exclusion of general intercourse, and thus contriving to dupe itself with delusions of Celestial perfection—that such an empire should at last be overtaken by fate on the occasion of a deadly duel, in which the representative of the antiquated world appears prompted by ethical motives, while the representative of overwhelming modern society fights for the privilege of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest markets—this, indeed, is a sort of tragical couplet stranger than any poet would ever have dared to fancy.

(Marx)

## **(The Chinese Market)**

---

*Not Dated / Published October 5, 1858*

The unsuccessful issue, in a commercial point of view, of Sir Henry Pottinger's Chinese treaty, signed on August 29, 1842,<sup>1</sup> and dictated, like the new treaties with China, at the cannon's mouth, is a fact now recollected even by that eminent organ of British free trade, the London *Economist*. Having stood forward as one of the staunchest apologists of the late invasion of China, that journal now feels itself obliged to "temper" the sanguine hopes which have been cultivated in other quarters. *The Economist* considers the effects on the British export trade of the treaty of 1842, "a precedent by which to guard ourselves against the result of mistaken operations." This certainly is sound advice. The reasons, however,

<sup>1</sup> The Treaty of Nanking, which ended the First Opium War.

which Mr. Wilson<sup>2</sup> alleges in explanation of the failure of the first attempt at forcibly enlarging the Chinese market for Western produce appear far from conclusive.

The first great cause pointed out of the signal failure is the speculative overstocking of the Chinese market, during the first three years following the Pottinger treaty, and the carelessness of the English merchants as to the nature of the Chinese demand. The English exports to China, which, in 1836, amounted to £1,326,388, had fallen in 1842 to £960,000. Their rapid and continued rise during the following six years is shown by these figures:

|            |           |            |             |
|------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| 1842 ..... | £ 960,000 | 1844 ..... | £ 2,305,000 |
| 1843 ..... | 1,456,000 | 1845 ..... | 2,396,000   |

Yet in 1846 the exports did not only sink below the level of 1836, but the disasters overtaking the China houses at London during the crisis of 1847 proved the *computed* value of the exports from 1843 to 1846, such as it appears in the official return tables, to have by no means corresponded to the value actually *realized*. If the English exporters thus erred in the quantity, they did not less so in the quality of the articles offered to Chinese consumption. In proof of the latter assertion, *The Economist* quotes from Mr. W. Cooke, the late correspondent of the *London Times* at Shanghai and Canton, the following passages:

In 1843, 1844 and 1845, when the northern ports had just been opened, the people at home were wild with excitement. An eminent firm at Sheffield sent out a large consignment of knives and forks, and declared themselves prepared to supply all China with cutlery. They were sold at prices which scarcely realized their freight. A London house, of famous name, sent out a tremendous consignment of pianofortes, which shared the same fate. What happened in the case of cutlery and pianos occurred also, in a less noticeable manner, in the case of

<sup>2</sup> James Wilson was the founder and first editor of *The Economist*.



worsted and cotton manufactures. Manchester made a great blind effort when the ports were opened, and that effort failed. Since then she has fallen into an apathy, and trusts to the chapter of accidents.

Lastly, to prove the dependence of the reduction, maintenance or improvement of the trade, on the study of the wants of the consumer, *The Economist* reproduces from the same authority the following return for the year 1856:

|                              | 1845      | 1846      | 1856      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Worsted Stuffs (pieces) .... | 13,569    | 8,415     | 7,428     |
| Camlets .....                | 13,374    | 8,034     | 4,470     |
| Long ells .....              | 91,530    | 75,784    | 36,642    |
| Woollens .....               | 62,731    | 56,996    | 83,583    |
| Printed Cottons .....        | 100,615   | 81,150    | 281,784   |
| Plain Cottons .....          | 2,998,126 | 1,859,740 | 2,817,624 |
| Cotton Twist, lbs. ....      | 2,640,098 | 5,324,050 | 5,579,600 |

Now all these arguments and illustrations explain nothing beyond the reaction following the overtrade of 1843-46. It is a phenomenon by no means peculiar to the Chinese trade that a sudden expansion of commerce should be followed by its violent contractions, or that a new market, at its opening, should be choked by British oversupplies, the articles thrown upon it being not very nicely calculated, in regard either to the actual wants or the paying powers of the consumers. In fact, this is a standing feature in the history of the markets of the world. On Napoleon's fall, after the opening of the European continent, British exports proved so disproportionate to the Continental faculties of absorption that "the transition from war to peace" proved more disastrous than the Continental system itself. Canning's recognition of the independence of the Spanish colonies in America was also instrumental in producing the commercial crisis of 1825. Wares calculated for the meridian of Moscow were then dispatched to Mexico and Colombia. And in our own day, notwithstand-

ing its elasticity, even Australia has not escaped the fate common to all new markets, of having its powers of consumption as well as its means of payment overstocked. The phenomenon peculiar to the Chinese market is this: that since its opening by the treaty of 1842, the export to Great Britain of tea and silk, of Chinese produce, has continually been expanding, while the import trade into China of British manufactures has, on the whole, remained stationary. The continuous and increasing balance of trade in favor of China might be said to bear an analogy to the state of commercial balance between Russia and Great Britain; but then, in the latter case, everything is explained by the protective policy of Russia, while the Chinese import duties are lower than those of any other country England trades with. The aggregate value of Chinese exports to England, which before 1842 might be rated at about £7,000,000, amounted in 1856 to the sum of about £9,500,000. While the quantity of tea imported into Great Britain never reached more than 50,000,000 lbs. before 1842, it had swollen in 1856 to about 90,000,000 lbs. On the other hand, the importance of the British import of Chinese silks only dates from 1852. Its progress may be computed from the following figures:

|            | 1852      | 1853      | 1854      | 1855      | 1856      |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Silk imp'd |           |           |           |           |           |
| lbs. ..    | 2,418,343 | 2,838,047 | 4,576,706 | 4,436,962 | 3,723,693 |
| Value £    | ....      | ....      | 3,318,112 | 3,013,396 | 3,676,116 |

Now take, on the other hand, the movement of the

| BRITISH EXPORTS TO CHINA VALUED IN POUNDS STERLING |           |            |             |  |  |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|--|--|
| 1834 .....                                         | £ 842,852 | 1836 ..... | £ 1,326,388 |  |  |
| 1835 .....                                         | 1,074,708 | 1838 ..... | 1,204,356   |  |  |

For the period following the opening of the market in 1842 and the acquisition of Hong Kong by the British, we find the following returns:

|            |            |                    |            |
|------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
| 1845 ..... | £2,359,000 | 1853 .....         | £1,749,597 |
| 1846 ..... | 1,200,000  | 1854 .....         | 1,000,716  |
| 1848 ..... | 1,445,950  | 1855 .....         | 1,122,241  |
| 1852 ..... | 2,508,599  | 1856, upward of .. | 2,000,000  |

*The Economist* tries to account for the stationary and relatively decreasing imports of British manufacture into the Chinese market by foreign competition, and Mr. Cooke is again quoted to bear witness to this proposition. According to this authority, the English are beaten by fair competition in the Chinese market in many branches of trade. The Americans, he says, beat the English in drills and sheetings. At Shanghai in 1856 the imports were 221,716 pieces of American drills, against 8,745 English, and 14,420 of American sheetings, against 1,240 English. In woollen goods, on the other hand, Germany and Russia are said to press hardly on their English rivals. We want no other proof than this illustration to convince us that Mr. Cooke and *The Economist* are both mistaken in the appreciation of the Chinese market. They consider as limited to the Anglo-Chinese trade features which are exactly reproduced in the trade between the United States and the Celestial Empire. In 1837, the excess of the Chinese exports to the United States over the imports into China was about £860,000. During the period since the treaty of 1842, the United States have received an annual average of £2,000,000 in Chinese produce, for which we paid in American merchandise £900,000. Of the £1,602,849 to which the aggregate imports into Shanghai, exclusive of specie and opium, amounted in 1855, England supplied £1,122,241, America £272,708, and other countries £207,900; while the exports reached a total of £12,603,540, of which £6,405,040 were to England, £5,396,406 to America, and £102,088 to other countries. Compare only the American exports to the value of £272,708 with their imports from Shanghai exceeding £5,000,000. If, nevertheless, American

competition has, to any sensible degree, made inroads on British traffic, how limited a field of employment for the aggregate commerce of foreign nations the Chinese market must offer.

The last cause assigned to the trifling importance the Chinese import market has assumed since its opening in 1842 is the Chinese revolution, but notwithstanding that revolution, the exports to China relatively [swelled] in 1851-52, in the general increase of trade, and, during the whole of the revolutionary epoch, the opium trade, instead of falling off, rapidly obtained colossal dimensions. However that may be, this much will be admitted, that all the obstacles to foreign imports originating in the disordered state of the Empire must be increased, instead of being diminished, by the late piratical war, and the fresh humiliations heaped on the ruling dynasty.

It appears to us, after a careful survey of the history of Chinese commerce, that, generally speaking, the consuming and paying powers of the Celestials have been greatly overestimated. With the present economical framework of Chinese society, which turns upon diminutive agriculture and domestic manufactures as its pivots, any large import of foreign produce is out of the question. Still, to the amount of £8,000,000, a sum which may be roughly calculated to form the aggregate balance in favor of China, as against England and the United States, it might gradually absorb a surplus quantity of English and American goods if the opium trade were suppressed. This conclusion is necessarily arrived at on the analysis of the simple fact that the Chinese finances and monetary circulation, in spite of the favorable balance of trade, are seriously deranged by an import of opium to the amount of about £7,000,000.

John Bull, however, used to plume himself on his high standard of morality, prefers to bring up his adverse balance of trade by periodical war tributes extorted from China on

piratical pretexts. He only forgets that the Carthaginian and Roman methods of making foreign people pay are, if combined in the same hands, sure to clash with and destroy each other.

(Marx)

# **The British and Chinese Treaty**

---

*Dated September 28, 1858 / Published October 15, 1858*

The official summary of the Anglo-Chinese treaty, which the British ministry has at last laid before the public, adds, on the whole, but little to the information that had already been conveyed through different other channels. The first and the last articles comprise, in fact, the points in the treaty of exclusively English interest. By the first article, "the supplementary treaty and general regulations of trade," stipulated after the conclusion of the treaty of Nanking, are "abrogated." That supplementary treaty provided that the English consuls residing at Hong Kong, and the five Chinese ports opened to British commerce, were to cooperate with the Chinese authorities in case any English vessels should arrive within the range of their consular jurisdiction with opium on board. A formal prohibition was thus laid upon English mer-

chants to import the contraband drug, and the English government, to some degree, constituted itself one of the custom-house officers of the Celestial Empire. That the Second Opium War should end in removing the fetters by which the First Opium War still affected to check the opium traffic appears a result quite logical, and a consummation devoutly called for by that part of the British mercantile public which chanted most lusty applause to Palmerston's Canton fireworks. We are, however, much mistaken if this official abandonment on the part of England of her hypocritical opposition to the opium trade is not to lead to consequences quite the reverse of those expected. By engaging the British government to cooperate in the suppression of the opium traffic, the Chinese government had recognized its inability to do so on its own account. The Supplementary Treaty of Nanking was a supreme and rather desperate effort at getting rid of the opium trade by foreign aid. This effort having failed, and being now proclaimed a failure, the opium traffic being now, so far as England is concerned, legalized, little doubt can remain that the Chinese government will try a method alike recommended by political and financial considerations—viz.: legalize the cultivation of the poppy in China, and lay duties on the foreign opium imported. Whatever may be the intentions of the present Chinese government, the very circumstances in which it finds itself placed by the treaty of Tientsin show all that way.

That change once effected, the opium monopoly of India, and with it the Indian exchequer, must receive a deadly blow, while the British opium traffic will shrink to the dimensions of an ordinary trade, and very soon prove a losing one. Till now, it has been a game played by John Bull with loaded dice. To have baffled its own object seems, therefore, the most obvious result of the opium war No. II.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The opium trade was quietly legalized again that November through the (tariff) Convention of Shanghai. Despite Marx's prediction, the trade continued to prove lucrative to Britain and India.

Having declared "a just war" on Russia, generous England desisted, at the conclusion of peace, from demanding any indemnity for her war expenses. Having, on the other hand, all along professed to be at peace with China itself, she, accordingly, cannot but make it pay for expenses incurred, in the opinion of her own present ministers, by piracy on her own part. However, the first tidings of the fifteen or twenty millions of pounds sterling to be paid by the Celestials proved a quieter to the most scrupulous British conscience, and very pleasant calculations as to the beneficial effects of the sycee silver upon the balance of trade, and the metal reserve of the Bank of England, were entered into by *The Economist* and the writers of money articles generally. But alas! the first impressions which the Palmerstonian press had given itself so much trouble to produce and work upon were too tender to bear the shock of real information.

A "separate article provides that a sum of two millions of taels" shall be paid "on account of the losses sustained by British subjects through the misconduct of the Chinese authorities at Canton; and a further sum of two millions of taels on account of the expenses of the war." Now, these sums together amount to £1,334,000 only, while in 1842 the Emperor of China had to pay £4,200,000, of which £1,200,000 was indemnity for the contraband opium confiscated, and £3,000,000, for the expenses of the war. To come down from £4,200,000, with Hong Kong into the bargain, to a simple £1,334,000, seems no thriving trade after all; but the worst remains still to be said. Since, says the Chinese Emperor, yours was no war with China, but a "provincial war" with Canton only, try yourselves how to squeeze out of the province of Kwangtung the damages which your amiable war steamers have compelled me to adjudge to you. Meanwhile, your illustrious Gen. Straubenzee<sup>2</sup> may keep Canton as a material guaranty, and continue to make the British arms the

<sup>2</sup> General Sir C. T. van Straubenzee commanded the British contingent in China, 1857-60.



laughingstock even of Chinese braves. The doleful feelings of sanguine John Bull at these clauses, which the small booty of £1,334,000 is encumbered with, have already vented themselves in audible groans. "Instead," says one London paper, "of being able to withdraw our 53 ships-of-war, and see them return triumphant with millions of Sycee silver, we may look forward to the pleasing necessity of sending an army of 5,000 men to recapture and hold Canton, and to assist the fleet in carrying on that provincial war which the consul's deputy has declared. But will this provincial war have no consequences beyond driving our Canton trade to other Chinese ports? . . . Will not the continuation of it [the provincial war] give Russia a large portion of the tea trade? May not the Continent, and England herself, become dependent on Russia and the United States for their tea?" John Bull's anxiety as to the effects of the "provincial war" upon the tea trade is not quite gratuitous. From Macgregor's Commercial Tariffs it may be seen that in the last year of the former Chinese war, Russia received 120,000 chests of tea at Kiachta. The year after the conclusion of peace with China the Russian demand fell off 75 per cent, amounting to 30,000 only. At all events, the costs still to be incurred by the British in distraining Kwangtung are sure so to swell the wrong side of the balance that this second China war will hardly be self-paying, the greatest fault which, as Mr. Emerson justly remarks, anything can be guilty of in British estimation.

Another great success of the English invasion is contained in Art. 51, according to which "the term barbarian is not to be applied to the British Government nor to British subjects in any Chinese official document issued by the Chinese authorities." The Chinese authorities styling themselves Celestials, how humble to their understanding must not appear John Bull, who, instead of insisting on being called divine or Olympian, contents himself with weeding the character representing the word barbarian out of the official documents.

The commercial articles of the treaty give England no ad-

vantage not to be enjoyed by her rivals, and, for the present, dissolve into shadowy promises, for the greater part not worth the parchment they are written on. Art. 10 stipulates:

British merchant ships shall have authority to trade upon the Great River (Yang-tse), but in the present disturbed state of the Upper and Lower Valley, no port is to be opened for trade with the exception of Chin-kiang, which is to be opened in a year from the signature of the Treaty. When peace is restored, British vessels are to be admitted to trade at such ports as far as Hankow, not exceeding three in number, as the British Minister, after consultation with the Chinese Secretary of State, shall determine.

By this article, the British are in fact excluded from the great commercial artery of the whole empire, from "the only line," as *The Morning Star* justly remarks, "by which they can push their manufactures into the interior." If they will be good boys, and help the imperial government in dislodging the rebels from the regions now occupied by them, then they may eventually navigate the great river, but only to particular harbors. As to the new seaports opened, from "all" the ports as at first advertised, they have dwindled down to five ports, added to the five ports of the Treaty of Nanking, and, as a London paper remarks, "they are generally remote or insular." Besides, at this time of the day, the delusive notion of the growth of trade being proportionate to the number of ports opened, should have been exploded. Consider the harbors on the coasts of Great Britain, or France, or the United States; how few of them have developed themselves into real emporiums of commerce? Before the first Chinese war, the English traded exclusively to Canton. The concession of five new ports, instead of creating five new emporiums of commerce, has gradually transferred trade from Canton to Shanghai, as may be seen from the following figures, extracted from the Parliamentary Blue Book on the trade of various places for 1856-57. At the same time, it should be

recollected that the Canton imports include the imports to Amoy and Pochow, which are transshipped at Canton.

|            | British import trade to |             | British export trade to |             |
|------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|
|            | Canton                  | Shanghai    | Canton                  | Shanghai    |
| 1844 ..... | \$15,500,000            | \$2,500,000 | \$17,900,000            | \$2,300,000 |
| 1845 ..... | 10,700,000              | 5,100,000   | 27,700,000              | 6,000,000   |
| 1846 ..... | 9,900,000               | 3,800,000   | 15,300,000              | 6,400,000   |
| 1847 ..... | 9,600,000               | 4,300,000   | 15,700,000              | 6,700,000   |
| 1848 ..... | 6,500,000               | 2,500,000   | 8,600,000               | 5,000,000   |
| 1849 ..... | 7,900,000               | 4,400,000   | 11,400,000              | 6,500,000   |
| 1850 ..... | 6,800,000               | 3,900,000   | 9,900,000               | 8,000,000   |
| 1851 ..... | 10,000,000              | 4,500,000   | 13,200,000              | 11,500,000  |
| 1852 ..... | 9,900,000               | 4,600,000   | 6,500,000               | 11,400,000  |
| 1853 ..... | 4,000,000               | 3,900,000   | 6,500,000               | 13,300,000  |
| 1854 ..... | 3,300,000               | 1,100,100   | 6,000,000               | 11,700,000  |
| 1855 ..... | 3,600,000               | 3,400,000   | 2,900,000               | 19,900,000  |
| 1856 ..... | 9,100,000               | 6,700,000   | 8,200,000               | 25,800,000  |

"The commercial clauses of the treaty are unsatisfactory," is a conclusion arrived at by *The Daily Telegraph*, Palmerston's most abject sycophant; but it chuckles at "the brightest point in the programme," viz.: "that the British Minister may establish himself at Peking, while a Mandarin will install himself in London, and possibly invite the Queen to a ball at Albert Gate." However John Bull may indulge this fun, there can be no doubt that whatever political influence may be exercised at Peking will fall to the part of Russia, which, by dint of the last treaty, holds a new territory, being as large as France, and, in great part, on its frontier, 800 miles only distant from Peking. It is by no means a comfortable reflection for John Bull that he himself, by his first opium war, procured Russia a treaty yielding her the navigation of the Amur and free trade on the land frontier, while by his second opium war he has helped her to the invaluable tract lying between the Gulf of Tartary and Lake Baikal, a region so much coveted by Russia that from Czar Aleksei Mikhailo-

vich down to Nicholas, she has always attempted to get it. So deeply did the London *Times* feel that sting that, in its publication of the St. Petersburg news, which greatly exaggerated the advantages won by Great Britain, good care was taken to suppress that part of the telegram which mentioned Russia's acquisition by treaty of the valley of the Amur.

(Marx)

# The New Chinese War (I)<sup>1</sup>

---

*Dated September 16, 1859 / Published October 1, 1859*

A cabinet council is announced for tomorrow in order to decide upon the course to be taken in regard to the Chinese catastrophe.<sup>2</sup> The lucubrations of the French *Moniteur* and the London *Times* leave no doubt as to the resolutions arrived at by Palmerston and Bonaparte. They want another Chinese war. I am informed from an authentic source that at the impending cabinet council Mr. Milner Gibson, in the first instance, will contest the validity of the plea for war; in the

<sup>1</sup> The numbers in parentheses are for the convenience of the reader. Both this and the following article are from a series published under the same title.

<sup>2</sup> Marx refers to the grotesque events leading to the continuation of the Second Opium War (this phase is sometimes called the Third Opium War). Representatives of the various Great Powers were to travel to Peking in June of 1859 to ratify the Treaty of Tientsin, signed a year earlier. The British representative, Admiral Hope, insisted on traveling on the "honorable"

second instance, will protest against any declaration of war not previously sanctioned by both Houses of Parliament; and if his opinion be overwhelmed by a majority of votes, will secede from the cabinet, thus again giving the signal for a new onslaught on Palmerston's administration and the break up of the Liberal coalition that led to the ousting of the Derby cabinet. Palmerston is said to feel somewhat nervous as to the intended proceedings of Mr. Milner Gibson, the only one of his colleagues whom he is afraid of, and whom he has characterized more than once as a man peculiarly able "in picking holes." It is possible that simultaneously with this letter you may receive from Liverpool the news of the results of the ministerial council. Meanwhile, the real bearing of the case in question may be best judged, not from what has been printed, but from what has been willfully suppressed by the Palmerston organs in their first publications of the news conveyed by the last overland mail.

First, then, they suppressed the statement that the Russian treaty had already been ratified, and that the Emperor of China had given instructions to his mandarins to receive and escort the American Embassy to the capital for the exchange of the ratified copies of the American treaty. These acts were suppressed with a view to stifle the suspicion that would naturally arise that the English and French envoys, instead of the Court of Peking, are responsible for meeting obstacles in the transaction of their business which were not encountered either by their Russian or American colleagues. The other, still more important, fact that was at first suppressed by *The Times*, and the other Palmerston organs, but is now avowed on their part, is that the Chinese authorities had given notice of their willingness to conduct the English and French envoys to Peking; that they were actually in waiting to receive

---

route up the Peiho River. The Chinese refused to allow this and, when Admiral Hope attempted to force a passage, fire from shore forts sank two British gunboats. British casualties: 89 dead, 337 wounded. The expeditionary force, a joint Anglo-French venture, retired to Shanghai.

them at one of the mouths of the river, and offered them an escort if they only consented to leave their vessels and troops. Now, as the treaty of Tientsin contains no clause granting to the English and French the right of sending a squadron of men-of-war up the Peiho, it becomes evident that the treaty was violated, not by the Chinese, but by the English, and that on the part of the latter there existed the foregone conclusion to pick a quarrel just before the period appointed for the exchange of the ratifications. Nobody will fancy that the Hon. Mr. Bruce<sup>3</sup> acted on his own responsibility in thus baffling the ostensible end aimed at by the last Chinese war, but that, on the contrary, he only executed secret instructions received from London. Now, it is true that Mr. Bruce was dispatched, not by Palmerston, but by Derby; but then I have only to remind you that during the first administration of Sir Robert Peel, when Lord Aberdeen kept the seals of the Foreign Office, Sir Henry Bulwer, the English Ambassador at Madrid, picked a quarrel with the Spanish Court, resulting in his expulsion from Spain, and that, during the debates in the House of Lords on this "untoward event," it was proved that Bulwer, instead of obeying the official instructions of Aberdeen, had acted up to the secret instructions of Palmerston, who then sat on the Opposition benches.

A maneuver has also been carried out during these last days in the Palmerstonian press which leaves no doubt, at least to those acquainted with the secret history of English diplomacy during the last thirty years, as to the real author of the Peiho catastrophe and the impending third Anglo-Chinese war. *The Times* intimates that the guns planted on the forts of Taku which caused such havoc among the British squadron were of Russian origin, and were directed by Russian officers. Another Palmerstonian organ is still more plain-spoken. I quote:

<sup>3</sup> Frederick Bruce, the British envoy.

We now perceive how closely the policy of Russia is interwoven with that of Peking; we detect great movements on the Amur; we discern large Cossack armies maneuvering far beyond Lake Baikal, in the frozen dreamland on the twilight borders of the Old World; we trace the course of innumerable caravans; we espy a special Russian envoy [Gen. Muraviev, the Governor of Eastern Siberia] making his way, with secret designs, from the remoteness of Eastern Siberia to the secluded Chinese metropolis; and well may public opinion in this country burn at the thought that foreign influences have had a share in procuring our disgrace and the slaughter of our soldiers and sailors.<sup>4</sup>

Now, this is one of Lord Palmerston's old tricks. When Russia wanted to conclude a treaty of commerce with China, he drove the latter by the Opium War into the arms of her northern neighbor. When Russia requested the cession of the Amur, he brought it about by the second Chinese war, and now that Russia wants to consolidate her influence at Peking, he extemporizes the third Chinese war. In all his transactions with the weak Asiatic states, with China, Persia, Central Asia, Turkey, it has always been his invariable and constant rule to ostensibly oppose Russia's designs by picking a quarrel, not with Russia, but with the Asiatic state, to estrange the latter from England by piratical hostilities, and by this roundabout way drive it to the concessions it had been unwilling to yield to Russia. You may be sure that on this occasion the whole past Asiatic policy of Palmerston will be again sifted, and I draw, therefore, your attention to the Afghan papers ordered by the House of Commons to be printed on the 8th June, 1839. They throw more light on Palmerston's sinister policy, and the diplomatic history of the last thirty years, than any documents ever before printed. The case is, in a few words, this: In 1838 Palmerston commenced a war against Dost Mohammed, the ruler of Kabul, a war

<sup>4</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, September 16, 1859.



that led to the destruction of an English army, and was commenced on the plea of Dost Mohammed having entered into a secret alliance against England with Persia and Russia. In proof of this assertion, Palmerston laid, in 1839, before Parliament, a Blue Book, chiefly consisting of the correspondence of Sir A. Burnes, the British envoy at Kabul, with the government at Calcutta. Burnes had been assassinated during an insurrection at Kabul against the English invaders, but, distrustful of the British Foreign Minister, had sent copies of some of his official letters to his brother, Dr. Burnes, at London. On the appearance, in 1839, of the "Afghan papers," prepared by Palmerston, Dr. Burnes accused him of having "garbled and forged the dispatches of the late Sir A. Burnes," and, in corroboration of his statement, had some of the genuine dispatches printed. But it was only last summer that the murder came out. Under the Derby ministry, on the motion of Mr. Hadfield, the House of Commons ordered all the Afghan papers to be published in full, and this order has been executed in such a form as to constitute a demonstration, to the meanest capacity, of the truth of the charge of garbling and forgery, in the *interest of Russia*. On the title page of the Blue Book appears the following:

*Note.—The correspondence, only partially given in former returns, is here given entire, the omitted passages being marked by brackets, [ ].*

The name of the official, which appears as a guaranty for the fidelity of the return, is "J. W. Kaye, Secretary in Political and Secret Departments," Mr. Kaye being the "upright historian of the War in Afghanistan."

Now, to illustrate the real relations of Palmerston with Russia, against which he pretended to have set up the Afghan war, one instance may suffice for the present. The Russian agent, Vikovich, who came to Kabul in 1837, was the bearer of a letter from the Czar to Dost Mohammed. Sir Al-

exander Burnes obtained a copy of the letter, and sent it to Lord Auckland, the Governor-General of India. In his own dispatches, and various documents inclosed by him, this circumstance is referred to over and over again. But the copy of the Czar's letter was expunged altogether from the papers presented by Palmerston in 1839, and in every dispatch in which it is referred to such alterations were made as were necessary to suppress the circumstance of the connection of the "Emperor of Russia" with the mission to Kabul. This forgery was committed in order to suppress the evidence of the Autocrat's connection with Vikovich, whom, on his return to St. Petersburg, it suited Nicholas to formally disavow. For instance, at page 82 of the Blue Book will be found the translation of a letter to Dost Mohammed, which reads now as follows, the brackets showing the words originally suppressed by Palmerston:

The ambassador on the part of [the] Russia [or Emperor] came [from Moscow] to Tehran, and has been appointed to wait on the Sirdars at Candahar, and thence to proceed to the presence of the Ameer. . . . He is the bearer of [confidential messages from the Emperor and of the] letters from the Russian ambassador at Tehran. The Russian ambassador recommends this man to be a most trusty individual, and to possess full authority to make any negotiations, [on the part of the Emperor and himself], etc., etc.

These, and similar forgeries committed by Palmerston in order to protect the honor of the Czar, are not the only curiosity exhibited by the "Afghan papers." The invasion of Afghanistan was justified by Palmerston on the ground that Sir Alexander Burnes had advised it as a proper means for baffling Russian intrigues in Central Asia. Now, Sir A. Burnes did quite the contrary, and consequently all his appeals on behalf of Dost Mohammed were altogether suppressed in Palmerston's edition of the "Blue Book," the correspondence

being, by dint of garbling and forgery, turned quite to the reverse of its original meaning. Such is the man now about to enter on a third Chinese war, on the ostensible plea of thwarting Russia's designs in that quarter.

(Marx)

## **The New Chinese War (II)**

---

*Dated September 30, 1859 / Published October 18, 1859*

In a former letter I asserted that the Peiho conflict had not sprung from accident, but, on the contrary, been beforehand prepared by Lord Elgin, acting upon Palmerston's secret instructions, and fastening upon Lord Malmesbury, the Tory Foreign Minister, the project of the noble viscount, then seated at the head of the Opposition benches. Now, first, the idea of the "accidents" in China arising from "instructions" drawn up by the present British Premier is so far from being new that, during the debates on the lorcha war, it was suggested to the House of Commons by so well-informed a personage as Mr. Disraeli, and, curious to say, confirmed by no less an authority than Lord Palmerston himself. On February 3, 1857, Mr. Disraeli warned the House of Commons in the following terms:

I cannot resist the conviction that what has taken place in China has not been in consequence of the alleged pretext, but is, in fact, in consequence of *instructions received from home*, some considerable time ago. If that be the case, I think the time has arrived when this House would not be doing its duty unless it earnestly considered whether it has any means of controlling a *system*, which if pursued, will be one, in my mind, fatal to the interests of this country.

And Lord Palmerston most coolly replied: "The right hon. gentleman says the course of events appeared to be the result of *some system predetermined by the Government at home*. Undoubtedly, it was."

In the present instance, a cursory glance at the Blue Book entitled: "*Correspondence relative to the Earl of Elgin's special missions to China and Japan, 1857-59*" will show how the event that occurred at Peiho on the 25th June was already recorded by Lord Elgin on the 2nd of March. Page 484 of the said correspondence, we find the following two dispatches.

THE EARL OF ELGIN TO REAR-ADMIRAL SIR MICHAEL SEYMOUR,

*Furious*, March 2, 1859.

SIR: With reference to my dispatch to your Excellency of the 17th ult., I would beg leave to state that I entertain some hope that the decision come to by her Majesty's Government on the subject of the permanent residence of a British Ambassador at Peking, which I communicated to your Excellency in a conversation yesterday, may induce the Chinese Government to receive, in a becoming manner, the representative of her Majesty, when he proceeds to Peking for the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty of Tien-tsin. At the same time, it is no doubt possible that this hope may not be realized, and, at any rate, I apprehend *that her Majesty's Government will desire* that our Ambassador, *when he proceeds to Tien-tsin*, be accompanied by an *imposing force*. Under these circumstances, I would venture to submit for your Excellency's consideration, whether it would not be expedient to concentrate at Shanghai, at the earliest convenient period, a *sufficient* fleet of gunboats

for this service, as Mr. Bruce's arrival in China cannot be long delayed. I have, etc. ELGIN and KINCARDINE.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY TO THE EARL OF ELGIN.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 2, 1859.

My LORD: I have received your Excellency's dispatch of the 7th of March, 1859, and I have to inform you that her Majesty's Government approve of the note, of which a copy is therein inclosed, and in which your Excellency announced to the Imperial Commissioners that her Majesty's Government would not insist upon the residence of her Majesty's Minister being permanently fixed at Peking.

Her Majesty's Government also approve of *your having suggested* to Rear-Admiral Seymour that a fleet of gunboats should be collected at Shanghai in order to accompany Mr. Bruce *up the Peiho*.

I am, etc.

MALMESBURY

Lord Elgin, then, knows beforehand that the British government "will desire" that his brother, Mr. Bruce, be accompanied by "an imposing force" of "gunboats" up the Peiho, and he orders Admiral Seymour to make ready "for this service." The Earl of Malmesbury, in his dispatch dated May 2, approved of the suggestion intimated by Lord Elgin to the Admiral. The whole correspondence exhibits Lord Elgin as the master, and Lord Malmesbury as the man. While the former constantly takes the initiative and acts upon the instructions originally received from Palmerston, without even waiting for new instructions from Downing Street, Lord Malmesbury contents himself with indulging "the desires" which his imperious subaltern anticipates him to feel. He nods assent when Elgin states that, the treaty being not yet ratified, they had not the right to ascend any Chinese river; he nods assent when Elgin thinks they ought to show much forbearance toward the Chinese in regard to the execution of the article of the treaty relating to the embassy to Peking; and, nothing daunted, he nods assent when in direct contra-

diction to his own former statements, Elgin claims the right to enforce the passage of the Peiho by an "imposing fleet of gunboats." He nods assent in the same way that Dogberry nodded assent to the suggestions of the sexton.

The sorry figure cut by the Earl of Malmesbury and the humility of his attitude are easily understood if one calls to mind the cry raised on the advent of the Tory Cabinet by the *London Times* and other influential papers as to the great peril threatening the brilliant success which Lord Elgin, under the instructions of Palmerston, was about to secure in China, but which the Tory administration, if for pique only, and in order to justify their vote of censure on Palmerston's Canton bombardment, were likely to baffle. Malmesbury allowed himself to be intimidated by that cry. He had, moreover, before his eyes and in his heart the fate of Lord Ellenborough, who had dared openly to counteract the Indian policy of the noble viscount, and, in reward for his patriotic courage, was sacrificed by his own colleagues of the Derby cabinet. Consequently, Malmesbury resigned the whole initiative into the hands of Elgin, and thus enabled the latter to execute Palmerston's plan on the responsibility of his official antagonists, the Tories. It is this same circumstance which for the present has put the Tories in a very dismal alternative as to the course to be taken in regard to the Peiho affair. Either they must sound the war trumpet with Palmerston, and thus keep him in office, or they must turn their backs on Malmesbury, upon whom they heaped such sickening flatteries during the late Italian war.

The alternative is the more trying since the impending third China war is anything but popular with the British mercantile classes. In 1857 they bestrode the British lion, because they expected great commercial profits from a forcible opening of the Chinese market. At this moment, they feel, on the contrary, rather angry at seeing the fruits of the treaty obtained all at once snapped away from their hold. They know that affairs look menacing enough in Europe and India,

without the further complication of a Chinese war on a grand scale. They have not forgotten that, in 1857, the imports of tea fell by upward of 24 millions of pounds, that being the article almost exclusively exported from Canton, which was then the exclusive theater of war, and they apprehend that this interruption of trade by war may now be extended to Shanghai and the other trading ports of the Celestial Empire. After a first Chinese war undertaken by the English in the interest of opium smuggling, and a second war carried on for the defense of the lorcha of a pirate, nothing was wanted for a climax but a war extemporized for the purpose of pestering China with the nuisance of permanent embassies at its capital.

(Marx)



# **The American Question in England**

---

*Dated September 18, 1861 / Published October 11, 1861*

Mrs. Beecher Stowe's letter to Lord Shaftesbury, whatever its intrinsic merit may be, has done a great deal of good by forcing the anti-Northern organs of the London press to speak out and lay before the general public the ostensible reasons for their hostile tone against the North and their ill-concealed sympathies with the South, which looks rather strange on the part of people affecting an utter horror of slavery. Their first main grievance is that the present American war is "not one for the abolition of slavery," and that, therefore, the high-minded Britisher, used to undertake wars of his own and interest himself in other people's wars only on the basis of "broad humanitarian principles," cannot be expected to feel any sympathy with his Northern cousins. "In the first place," says *The Economist*, "the assumption that

the quarrel between the North and South is a quarrel between Negro freedom on the one side and Negro slavery on the other is as impudent as it is untrue." "The North," says *The Saturday Review*, "does not proclaim Abolition, and never pretended to fight for anti-slavery. The North has not hoisted for its oriflamme the sacred symbol of justice to the Negro; its *cri de guerre* is not unconditional abolition." "If," says *The Examiner*, "we have been deceived about the real significance of the sublime movement, who but the Federalists themselves have to answer for the deception?"

Now, in the first instance, the premise must be conceded. The war has not been undertaken with a view to put down slavery, and the United States authorities themselves have taken the greatest pains to protest against any such idea. But then, it ought to be remembered that it was not the North, but the South, which undertook this war; the former acting only on the defense. If it be true that the North, after long hesitations and an exhibition of forbearance unknown in the annals of European history, drew at last the sword, not for crushing slavery, but for saving the Union, the South, on its part, inaugurated the war by loudly proclaiming "the peculiar institution" as the only and main end of the rebellion. It confessed to fight for the liberty of enslaving other people, a liberty which, despite the Northern protests, it asserted to be put in danger by the victory of the Republican Party and the election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidential chair. The Confederate Congress boasted that its newfangled Constitution, as distinguished from the Constitution of the Washingtons, Jeffersons, and Adamses, had recognized for the first time slavery as a thing good in itself, a bulwark of civilization, and a divine institution. If the North professed to fight but for the Union, the South gloried in rebellion for the supremacy of slavery. If antislavery and idealistic England felt not attracted by the profession of the North, how came it to pass that it was not violently repulsed by the cynical confessions of the South?

*The Saturday Review* helps itself out of this ugly dilemma by disbelieving the declarations of the seceders themselves. It sees deeper than this, and discovers "*that slavery had very little to do with secession*," the declarations of Jeff[erson] Davis and company to the contrary being mere "conventionalisms" with "about as much meaning as the conventionalisms about violated altars and desecrated hearths, which always occur in such proclamations."

The staple of argument on the part of the anti-Northern papers is very scanty, and throughout all of them we find almost the same sentences recurring, like the formulas of a mathematical series, at certain intervals, with very little art of variation or combination. "Why," exclaims *The Economist*, "it is only yesterday, when the secession movement first gained serious head, on the first announcement of Mr. Lincoln's election, that the Northerners offered to the South, if they would remain in the Union, every conceivable security for the performance and inviolability of the obnoxious institution—that they disavowed in the most solemn manner all intention of interfering with it—that their leaders proposed compromise after compromise in Congress, all based upon the concession that slavery should not be meddled with." "How happens it," says *The Examiner*, "that the North was ready to compromise matters by the largest concessions to the South as to slavery? How was it that a certain geographical line was proposed in Congress within which slavery was to be recognized as an essential institution? The Southern states were not content with this."

What *The Economist* and *The Examiner* had to ask was not only why the Crittenden and other compromise measures were *proposed* in Congress, but why they were not *passed*.<sup>1</sup> They affect to consider those compromise proposals as accepted by the North and rejected by the South, while, in

<sup>1</sup> In December 1860 Congressman Crittenden of Kentucky proposed a plan to avert conflict between North and South. His proposal, one of several put forward in Congress, was unacceptable to Lincoln's Free-Soil followers.

point of fact, they were baffled by the Northern party that had carried the Lincoln election. Proposals never matured into resolutions, but always remaining in the embryo of *pia desideria*, the South had, of course, never any occasion either of rejecting or acquiescing. We come nearer to the pith of the question by the following remark of *The Examiner*:

Mrs. Stowe says, "The slave party, finding they could no longer use the Union for their purposes, resolved to destroy it." There is here an admission that up to that time the slave party had used the Union for their purposes, and it would have been well if Mrs. Stowe could have distinctly shown where it was that the North began to make its stand against slavery.

One might suppose that *The Examiner* and the other oracles of public opinion in England had made themselves sufficiently familiar with contemporaneous history to not need Mrs. Stowe's information on such all-important points. The progressive abuse of the Union by the slave power, working through its alliance with the Northern Democratic Party, is, so to say, the general formula of United States history since the beginning of this century. The successive compromise measures mark the successive degrees of the encroachment by which the Union became more and more transformed into the slave of the slaveowner. Each of these compromises denotes a new encroachment of the South, a new concession of the North. At the same time none of the successive victories of the South was carried but after a hot contest with an antagonistic force in the North, appearing under different party names with different watchwords and under different colors. If the positive and final result of each single contest told in favor of the South, the attentive observer of history could not but see that every new advance of the slave power was a step forward to its ultimate defeat. Even at the time of the Missouri Compromise the contending forces were so evenly balanced that Jefferson, as we see from his memoirs, appre-

hended the Union to be in danger of splitting on that deadly antagonism. The encroachments of the slaveholding power reached their maximum point, when, by the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, for the first time in the history of the United States, as Mr. Douglas himself confessed, every legal barrier to the diffusion of slavery within the United States territories was broken down, when afterward, a Northern candidate<sup>2</sup> bought his Presidential nomination by pledging the Union to conquer or purchase in Cuba a new field of dominion for the slaveholder; when later on, by the Dred Scott decision, diffusion of slavery by the Federal power was proclaimed as the law of the American Constitution, and lastly, when the African slave trade was *de facto* reopened on a larger scale than during the times of its legal existence. But, concurrently with this climax of Southern encroachments, carried by the connivance of the Northern Democratic Party, there were unmistakable signs of Northern antagonistic agencies having gathered such strength as must soon turn the balance of power. The Kansas war, the formation of the Republican Party, and the large vote cast for Mr. Frémont during the Presidential election of 1856, were so many palpable proofs that the North had accumulated sufficient energies to rectify the aberrations which United States history, under the slave-owners' pressure, had undergone for half a century, and to make it return to the true principles of its development. Apart from those political phenomena, there was one broad statistical and economical fact indicating that the abuse of the Federal Union by the slave interest had approached the point from which it would have to recede forcibly, or *de bonne grace*. That fact was the growth of the Northwest, the immense strides its population had made from 1850 to 1860, and the new and reinvigorating influence it could not but bear on the destinies of the United States.

Now, was all this a secret chapter of history? Was "the admission" of Mrs. Beecher Stowe wanted to reveal to *The*

<sup>2</sup> James Buchanan, Democratic candidate in 1856.

*Examiner* and the other political *illuminati* of the London press the carefully hidden truth that "up to that time the slave party had used the Union for their purposes"? Is it the fault of the American North that the English pressmen were taken quite unawares by the violent clash of the antagonistic forces, the friction of which was the moving power of its history for half a century? Is it the fault of the Americans that the English press mistake for the fanciful crotchet hatched in a single day what was in the reality the matured result of long years of struggle? The very fact that the formation and the progress of the Republican Party in America have hardly been noticed by the London press speaks volumes as to the hollowness of its antislavery tirades. Take, for instance, the two antipodes of the London press, the *London Times* and *Reynolds' Weekly Newspaper*, the one the great organ of the respectable classes, and the other the only remaining organ of the working class. The former, not long before Mr. Buchanan's career drew to an end, published an elaborate apology for his administration and a defamatory libel against the Republican movement. Reynolds, on his part, was, during Mr. Buchanan's stay at London,<sup>3</sup> one of his minions, and since that time never missed an occasion to write him up and to write his adversaries down. How did it come to pass that the Republican Party, whose platform was drawn up on the avowed antagonism to the encroachments of the slavocracy and the abuse of the Union by the slave interest, carried the day in the North? How, in the second instance, did it come to pass that the great bulk of the Northern Democratic Party, flinging aside its old connections with the leaders of slavocracy, setting at naught its traditions of half a century, sacrificing great commercial interests and greater political prejudices, rushed to the support of the present Republican administration and offered it men and money with an unsparing hand?

<sup>3</sup> Buchanan was Minister to England during the Pierce administration.

Instead of answering these questions *The Economist* exclaims:

Can we forget that Abolitionists have habitually been as ferociously persecuted and maltreated in the North and West as in the South? Can it be denied that the testiness and half-heartedness, not to say insincerity, of the government at Washington have for years supplied the chief impediment which has thwarted our efforts for the effectual suppression of the slave trade on the coast of Africa; while a vast proportion of the clippers actually engaged in that trade have been built with Northern capital, owned by Northern merchants and manned by Northern seamen?

This is, in fact, a masterly piece of logic. Antislavery England cannot sympathize with the North breaking down the withering influence of slavocracy, because she cannot forget that the North, while bound by that influence, supported the slave trade, mobbed the Abolitionists, and had its democratic institutions tainted by the slavedriver's prejudices. She cannot sympathize with Mr. Lincoln's administration, because she had to find fault with Mr. Buchanan's administration. She must needs sullenly cavil at the present movement of the Northern resurrection, cheer up the Northern sympathizers with the slave trade, branded in the Republican platform, and coquet with the Southern slavocracy, setting up an empire of its own, because she cannot forget that the North of yesterday was not the North of today. The necessity of justifying its attitude by such pettifogging Old Bailey pleas proves more than anything else that the anti-Northern part of the English press is instigated by hidden motives, too mean and dastardly to be openly avowed.

As it is one of its pet maneuvers to taunt the present Republican administration with the doings of its proslavery predecessors, so it tries hard to persuade the English people that *The New York Herald* ought to be considered the only authentic expositor of Northern opinion. The *London Times*

having given out the cue in this direction the *servum pecus* of the other anti-Northern organs, great and small, persist in beating the same bush. So says *The Economist*:

In the light of the strife, New York papers and New York politicians were not wanting who exhorted the combatants, now that they had large armies in the field, to employ them, not against each other, but against Great Britain—to compromise the internal quarrel, the slave question included, and invade the British territory without notice and with overwhelming force.

*The Economist* knows perfectly well that *The New York Herald's* efforts, which were eagerly supported by the *London Times*, at embroiling the United States into a war with England, only intended securing the success of secession and thwarting the movement of Northern regeneration.

Still there is one concession made by the anti-Northern English press. *The Saturday [Review]* snob tells us:

What was at issue in Lincoln's election, and what has precipitated the convulsion, was merely *the limitation of the institution of slavery to states where that institution already exists.*

And *The Economist* remarks:

It is true enough that it was the aim of the Republican Party which elected Mr. Lincoln to prevent slavery from *spreading* into the unsettled Territories. . . . It may be true that the success of the North, if complete and unconditional, would enable them to confine slavery within the fifteen states which have already adopted it, and might thus lead to its eventual extinction—though this is rather probable than certain.

In 1859, on the occasion of John Brown's Harper's Ferry expedition, the very same *Economist* published a series of elaborate articles with a view to prove that, by dint of an *economical law*, American slavery was doomed to gradual



extinction from the moment it should be deprived of its power of expansion. That "economical law" was perfectly understood by the slavocracy. "In 15 years more," said Toombs, "without a great increase in slave territory, either the slaves must be permitted to flee from the whites, or the whites must flee from the slaves." The limitation of slavery to its constitutional area, as proclaimed by the Republicans, was the distinct ground upon which the menace of secession was first uttered in the House of Representatives on December 19, 1859. Mr. Singleton (Mississippi) having asked Mr. Curtis (Iowa), if the Republican Party would never let the South have another foot of slave territory while it remained in the Union, and Mr. Curtis having responded in the affirmative, Mr. Singleton said *this would dissolve the Union*. His advice to Mississippi was the sooner it got out of the Union the better—"gentlemen should recollect that Jefferson Davis led our forces in Mexico, and still he lives, perhaps to lead the Southern army." Quite apart from the *economical law* which makes the diffusion of slavery a vital condition for its maintenance within its constitutional areas, the leaders of the South had never deceived themselves as to the necessity for keeping up their *political* sway over the United States. John Calhoun, in the defense of his propositions to the Senate, stated distinctly on February 19, 1847, "that the Senate was the only balance of power left to the South in the government," and that the creation of new slave states had become necessary "for the retention of the equipoise of power in the Senate." Moreover, the oligarchy of the 300,000 slave-owners could not even maintain their sway at home save by constantly throwing out to their white plebeians the bait of prospective conquests within and without the frontiers of the United States. If, then, according to the oracles of the English press, the North had arrived at the fixed resolution of circumscribing slavery within its present limits, and of thus extinguishing it in a constitutional way, was this not sufficient to enlist the sympathies of antislavery England?

But the English Puritans seem indeed not to be contented save by an explicit Abolitionist war. "This," says *The Economist*, "therefore, not being a war for the emancipation of the Negro race, on what other ground can we be fairly called upon to sympathize so warmly with the Federal cause?" "There was a time," says *The Examiner*, "when our sympathies were with the North, thinking that it was really in earnest in making a stand against the encroachments of the slave states, and in adopting emancipation as a measure of justice to the black race."

However, in the very same number in which these papers tell us that they cannot sympathize with the North because its war is no Abolitionist war, we are informed that "the desperate expedient of proclaiming Negro emancipation and summoning the slaves to a general insurrection," is a thing "the mere conception of which is repulsive and dreadful," and that "a compromise" would be "far preferable to success purchased at such a cost and *stained by such a crime.*"

Thus the English eagerness for the Abolitionist war is all cant. The cloven foot peeps out in the following sentences: "Lastly," says *The Economist*, "is the *Morrill tariff* a title to our gratitude and to our sympathy, or is the certainty that, in case of Northern triumph, that tariff should be extended over the whole republic, a reason why we ought to be clamorously anxious for their success?" "The North Americans," says *The Examiner*, "are in earnest about nothing but a selfish protective tariff. . . . The Southern states were tired of being robbed of the fruits of their slave labor by the protective tariff of the North."

*The Examiner* and *The Economist* complement each other. The latter is honest enough to confess at last that with it and its followers sympathy is a mere question of tariff, while the former reduces the war between North and South to a tariff war, to a war between protection and free trade. *The Examiner* is perhaps not aware that even the South Carolina Nullifiers of 1832, as General Jackson testified, used

protection only as a pretext for secession; but even *The Examiner* ought to know that the present rebellion did not wait upon the passing of the Morrill tariff for breaking out. In point of fact, the Southerners could not have been tired of being robbed of the fruits of their slave labor by the protective tariff of the North, considering that from 1846-61 a free trade tariff had obtained.

*The Spectator* characterizes in its last number the secret thought of some of the anti-Northern organs in the following striking manner:

What, then, do the anti-Northern organs really profess to think desirable, under the justification of this plea of deferring to the inexorable logic of facts? They argue that disunion is desirable, just because, as we have said, it is the only possible step to a conclusion of this "causeless and fratricidal strife"; and next, of course, only as an afterthought, and as an humble apology for Providence and "justification of the ways of God to man," now that the inevitable necessity stands revealed—for further reasons discovered as beautiful adaptations to the moral exigencies of the country, when once the issue is discerned. It is discovered that it will be very much for the advantage of the states to be dissolved into rival groups. They will mutually check each other's ambition; they will neutralize each other's power, and if ever England should get into a dispute with one or more of them, mere jealousy will bring the antagonistic groups to our aid. This will be, it is urged, a very wholesome state of things, for it will relieve us from anxiety and it will encourage political "competition," that great safeguard of honesty and purity, among the states themselves.

Such is the case—very gravely urged—of the numerous class of Southern sympathizers now springing up among us. Translated into English—and we grieve that an English argument on such a subject should be of a nature that requires translating—it means that we deplore the present great scale of this "fratricidal" war, because it may concentrate in one fearful spasm a series of chronic petty wars and passions and jealousies among groups of rival states in times to come. The real truth is,

and this very un-English feeling distinctly discerns this truth, though it cloaks it in decent phrases, that rival groups of American states could not live together in peace or harmony. The chronic condition would be one of malignant hostility rising out of the very causes which have produced the present contest. It is asserted that the different groups of states have different tariff interests. These different tariff interests would be sources of constant petty wars if the states were once dissolved, and slavery, the root of all the strife, would be the spring of innumerable animosities, discords and campaigns. No stable equilibrium could ever again be established among the rival states. And yet it is maintained that this long future of incessant strife is the providential solution of the great question now at issue, the only real reason why it is looked upon favorably being this, that whereas the present great-scale conflict may issue in a restored and stronger political unity, the alternative of infinitely multiplied small-scale quarrels will issue in a weak and divided continent, that England cannot fear.

Now we do not deny that the Americans themselves sowed the seeds of this petty and contemptible state of feeling by the unfriendly and bullying attitude they have so often manifested to England, but we do say that the state of feeling on our part is petty and contemptible. We see that in a deferred issue there is no hope of a deep and enduring tranquillity for America, that it means a decline and fall of the American nation into quarrelsome clans and tribes, and yet hold up our hands in horror at the present "fratricidal" strife because it holds out hopes of finality. We exhort them to look favorably on the indefinite future of small strifes, equally fratricidal and probably far more demoralizing, because the latter would draw out of our side the thorn of American rivalry.

(Marx)

# **The British Cotton Trade**

---

*Dated September 21, 1861 / Published October 14, 1861*

The continual rise in the prices of raw cotton begins at last to seriously react upon the cotton factories, their consumption of cotton being now 25 per cent less than the full consumption. This result has been brought about by a daily lessening rate of production, many mills working only four or three days per week, part of the machinery being stopped, both in those establishments where short time has been commenced and in those which are still running full time, and some mills being temporarily altogether closed. In some places, as at Blackburn, for instance, short time has been coupled with a reduction of wages. However, the short-time movement is only in its incipient state and we may predict with perfect security that some weeks later the trade will have generally resorted to three days' working per week,

concurrently with a large stoppage of machinery in most establishments. On the whole, English manufacturers and merchants were extremely slow and reluctant in acknowledging the awkward position of their cotton supplies. "The whole of the last American crop," they said, "has long since been forwarded to Europe. The picking of the new crop has barely commenced. Not a bale of cotton could have reached us more than has reached us, even if the war and the blockade had never been heard of. The shipping season does not commence till far in November, and it is usually the end of December before any large exportations take place. Till then, it is of little consequence whether the cotton is retained on the plantations or is forwarded to the ports as fast as it is bagged. If the blockade ceases any time *before the end of this year*, the probability is that by March or April we shall have received just as full a supply of cotton as if the blockade had never been declared." In the innermost recesses of the mercantile mind the notion was cherished that the whole American crisis, and, consequently the blockade, would have ceased before the end of the year, or that Lord Palmerston would forcibly break through the blockade. The latter idea had been altogether abandoned, since, beside all other circumstances, Manchester became aware that two vast interests, the monetary interest, having sunk an immense capital in the industrial enterprises of Northern America, and the corn trade, relying on Northern America as its principal source of supply, would combine to check any unprovoked aggression on the part of the British government. The hopes of the blockade being raised in due time for the requirements of Liverpool or Manchester, or the American war being wound up by a compromise with the secessionists, have given way before a feature hitherto unknown in the English cotton market, viz., American operations in cotton at Liverpool, partly on speculation, partly for reshipment to America. Consequently, for the last two weeks the Liverpool cotton market has been feverishly excited, the speculative in-

vestments in cotton on the part of the Liverpool merchants being backed by speculative investments on the part of the Manchester and other manufacturers eager to provide themselves with stocks of raw material for the winter. The extent of the latter transactions is sufficiently shown by the fact that a considerable portion of the spare warehouse room in Manchester is already occupied by such stocks, and that throughout the week beginning with September 15 and ending with September 22, Middling Americans had increased  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb., and fair ones  $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

From the outbreak of the American war the prices of cotton were steadily rising, but the ruinous disproportion between the prices of the raw material and the prices of yarns and cloth was not declared until the last weeks of August. Till then, any serious decline in the prices of cotton manufactures which might have been anticipated from the considerable decrease of the American demand had been balanced by an accumulation of stocks in first hands, and by speculative consignments to China and India. Those Asiatic markets, however, were soon overdone. "Stocks," says *The Calcutta Price Current* of August 7, 1861, "are accumulating, the arrivals since our last being no less than 24,000,000 yards of plain cottons. Home advices show a continuation of shipments in excess of our requirements, and so long as this is the case, improvement cannot be looked for. . . . The Bombay market, also, has been greatly oversupplied." Some other circumstances contributed to contract the Indian market. The late famine in the northwestern provinces has been succeeded by the ravages of the cholera, while throughout lower Bengal an excessive fall of rain, laying the country under water, seriously damaged the rice crops. In letters from Calcutta which reached England last week, sales were reported giving a net return of  $9\frac{1}{2}$ d. per pound for 40s twist, which cannot be bought at Manchester for less than  $11\frac{1}{2}$ d., while sales of 4C-inch shirtings, compared with present rates at Manchester, yield losses at  $7\frac{1}{2}$ d., 9d. and 12d. per piece.

In the China market, prices were also forced down by the accumulation of the stocks imported. Under these circumstances, the demand for the British cotton manufactures decreasing, their prices can, of course, not keep pace with the progressive rise in the price of the raw material; but, on the contrary, the spinning, weaving, and printing of cotton must, in many instances, cease to pay the costs of production. Take, as an example, the following case, stated by one of the greatest Manchester manufacturers, in reference to coarse spinning:

|                           | <i>Per lb.</i> | <i>Margin</i> | <i>Cost of Spinning<br/>per lb.</i> |
|---------------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Sept. 17, 1860</i>     |                |               |                                     |
| Cost of cotton            | 6½d.           | 4d.           | 3d.                                 |
| 16s warp sold for         | 10½d.          | —             | —                                   |
| Profit, 1d. per lb.       |                |               |                                     |
| <br><i>Sept. 17, 1861</i> |                |               |                                     |
| Cost of cotton            | 9d.            | 2d.           | 3½d.                                |
| 16s warp sold for         | 11d.           | —             | —                                   |
| Loss, 1½d. per lb.        |                |               |                                     |

The consumption of Indian cotton is rapidly growing, and with a further rise in prices the Indian supply will come forward at increasing ratios; but still it remains impossible to change, at a few months' notice, all the conditions of production and turn the current of commerce. England pays now, in fact, the penalty for her protracted misrule of that vast Indian empire. The two main obstacles she has now to grapple with in her attempts at supplanting American cotton by Indian cotton is the want of means of communication and transport throughout India, and the miserable state of the Indian peasant, disabling him from improving favorable circumstances. Both these difficulties the English have themselves to thank for. English modern industry, in general, relied upon two pivots equally monstrous. The one was the potato as the only means of feeding Ireland and a great part of



the English working class. This pivot was swept away by the potato disease and the subsequent Irish catastrophe. A larger basis for the reproduction and maintenance of the toiling millions had then to be adopted. The second pivot of English industry was the slave-grown cotton of the United States. The present American crisis forces them to enlarge their field of supply and emancipate cotton from slave-breeding and slave-consuming oligarchies. As long as the English cotton manufacturers depended on slave-grown cotton, it could be truthfully asserted that they rested on a twofold slavery, the indirect slavery of the white man in England and the direct slavery of the black man on the other side of the Atlantic.

(Marx)

## The London "Times" on the Orleans Princes in America

---

*Dated October 12, 1861 / Published November 7, 1861*

On the occasion of the King of Prussia's visit at Compiègne, the London *Times* published some racy articles, giving great offense on the other side of the Channel. The *Pays*, *Journal de l'Empire*, in its turn characterized *The Times* writers as people whose heads were poisoned by gin, and whose pens were dipped into mud. Such occasional exchanges of invective are only intended to mislead public opinion as to the intimate relations connecting Printing House Square to the Tuileries. There exists beyond the French frontiers no greater sycophant of the Man of December<sup>1</sup> than the London *Times*, and its services are the more invaluable, the more that paper now and then assumes the tone and the air of a Cato censor toward its Caesar. *The*

<sup>1</sup> Louis Bonaparte, Napoleon III.

*Times* had for months heaped insult upon Prussia. Improving the miserable MacDonald affair, it had told Prussia that England would feel glad to see a transfer of the Rhenish provinces from the barbarous sway of the Hohenzollern to the enlightened despotism of a Bonaparte. It had not only exasperated the Prussian dynasty, but the Prussian people. It had written down the idea of an Anglo-Prussian alliance in case of a Prussian conflict with France. It had strained all its powers to convince Prussia that she had nothing to hope from England, and that the next best thing she could do would be to come to some understanding with France. When at last the weak and trimming monarch of Prussia resolved upon the visit at Compiègne, *The Times* could proudly exclaim: "*quorum magna pars fui*," but now the time had also arrived for obliterating from the memory of the British the fact that *The Times* had been the pathfinder of the Prussian monarch. Hence the roar of its theatrical thunders. Hence the counter roars of the *Pays*, *Journal de l'Empire*.

*The Times* had now recovered its position of the deadly antagonist of Bonapartism, and, therefore, the power of lending its aid to the Man of December. An occasion soon offered. Louis Bonaparte is, of course, most touchy whenever the renown of rival pretenders to the French crown is concerned. He had covered himself with ridicule in the affair of the Duc d'Aumale's pamphlet against Plon-Plon,<sup>2</sup> and, by his proceedings, had done more in furtherance of the Orleanist case than all the Orleanist partisans combined. Again, in these latter days, the French people were called upon to draw a parallel between Plon-Plon and the Orleans princes. When Plon-Plon set out for America, there were caricatures circulated in the Faubourg St. Antoine representing him as a fat man in search of a crown, but professing at the same time to be a most inoffensive traveler, with a peculiar aversion to the smell of powder. While Plon-Plon is returning to France

<sup>2</sup> The Duc d'Aumale was the son of King Louis Philippe; "Plon-Plon" was Joseph Charles Paul Napoleon.

with no more laurels than he gathered in the Crimea and in Italy, the Princes of Orleans cross the Atlantic to take service in the ranks of the national army. Hence a great stir in the Bonapartist camp. It would not do to give vent to Bonapartist anger through the venal press of Paris. The imperialist fears would thus only be betrayed, the pamphlet scandal renewed, and odious comparisons provoked between exiled princes who fight under the republican banner against the enslavers of working millions, with another exiled prince, who had himself sworn in as an English special constable to share in the glory of putting down an English workingmen's movement.<sup>3</sup>

Who should extricate the Man of December out of his dilemma? Who but the London *Times*? If the same London *Times* which on the 6th, 8th, and 9th of October, 1861, had roused the furies of the *Pays*, *Journal de l'Empire* by its rather cynical strictures on the visit at Compiègne—if that very same paper should come out on the 12th of October with a merciless onslaught on the Orleans princes because of their enlistment in the ranks of the national army of the United States, would Louis Bonaparte not have proved his case against the Orleans princes? Would *The Times* article not be done into French, commented upon by the Paris papers, sent by the *Préfet de Police* to all the journals of all the departments, and circulated throughout the whole of France, as the impartial sentence passed by the London *Times*, the personal foe of Louis Bonaparte, upon the last proceedings of the Orleans princes? Consequently, *The Times* of today has come out with a most scurrilous onslaught on these princes.

Louis Bonaparte is, of course, too much of a businessman to share the judicial blindness in regard to the American war of the official public-opinion mongers. He knows that the true people of England, of France, of Germany, of Europe,

<sup>3</sup> Louis Bonaparte, who lived in London at the time of the Chartist agitation.

consider the cause of the United States as their own cause, as the cause of liberty, and that, despite all paid sophistry, they consider the soil of the United States as the free soil of the landless millions of Europe, as their land of promise, now to be defended sword in hand, from the sordid grasp of the slaveholder. Louis Napoleon knows, moreover, that in France the masses connect the fight for the maintenance of the Union with the fight of their forefathers for the foundation of American independence, and that with them every Frenchman drawing his sword for the national government appears only to execute the bequest of Lafayette. Bonaparte, therefore, knows that if anything is able to win the Orleans princes good opinions from the French people it will be their enlistment in the ranks of the national army of the United States. He shudders at this very notion, and consequently the *London Times*, his censorious sycophant, today tells the Orleans princes that "they will derive no increase of popularity with the French nation from stooping to serve on this *ignoble field of action*." Louis Napoleon knows that all the wars waged in Europe between hostile nations since his *coup d'état*,<sup>4</sup> have been mock wars, groundless, wanton, and carried on on false pretenses. The Russian war,<sup>5</sup> and the Italian war [1859], not to speak of the piratical expeditions against China, Cochin-China, and so forth, never enlisted the sympathies of the French people, instinctively aware that both wars were carried on only with the view to strengthening the chains forged by the *coup d'état*. The first grand war of contemporaneous history is the American war.

The people of Europe know that the Southern slavocracy commenced that war with the declaration that the continuance of slavocracy was no longer compatible with the continuance of the Union. Consequently, the people of Europe know that a fight for the continuance of the Union is a fight

<sup>4</sup> Of December 2, 1851.

<sup>5</sup> The Crimean War.

against the continuance of the slavocracy—that in this contest the highest form of popular self-government till now realized is giving battle to the meanest and most shameless form of man's enslaving recorded in the annals of history.

Louis Bonaparte feels, of course, extremely sorry that the Orleans princes should embark in just such a war, so distinguished, by the vastness of its dimensions and the grandeur of its ends, from the groundless, wanton, and diminutive wars Europe has passed through since 1849. Consequently, the *London Times* must needs declare: "To overlook the difference between a war waged by hostile nations, and this most groundless and wanton civil conflict of which history gives us any account, is a species of offense against public morals."

*The Times* is, of course, bound to wind up its onslaught on the Orleans princes because of their "stooping to serve on such an ignoble field of action," with a deep bow before the victor of Sebastopol and Solferino. "It is unwise," says the *London Times*, "to challenge a comparison between such actions as Springfield and Manassas, and the exploits of Sebastopol and Solferino." The next mail will testify to the premeditated use made of *The Times* article by the imperialist organs. A friend in times of need is proverbially worth a thousand friends in times of prosperity, and the secret ally of the *London Times* is just now very badly off.

A dearth of cotton, backed by a dearth of grain; a commercial crisis coupled with an agricultural distress, and both of them combined with a reduction of customs revenues and a monetary embarrassment compelling the Bank of France to screw its rate of discount to six per cent, to enter into transactions with Rothschilds and Baring for a loan of two millions sterling on the London market, to pawn abroad French government stock, and with all that to show but a reserve of 12,000,000 against liabilities amounting to more than 40,000,000. Such a state of economical affairs prepares just the situation for rival pretenders to stake double. Already there have

been bread riots in the Faubourg St. Antoine, and this of all times is therefore the most inappropriate time for allowing Orleans princes to catch popularity. Hence the fierce forward rush of the *London Times*.

(Marx)

## **The News and Its Effects in London (The Seizure of the Rebel Envoys)**

---

*Dated November 30, 1861 /*

*Published December 19, 1861*

Since the declaration of war against Russia I never witnessed an excitement throughout all the strata of English society equal to that produced by the news of the *Trent* affair, conveyed to Southampton by the *La Plata* on the 27th inst. At about 2 o'clock P.M., by means of the electric telegraph, the announcement of the "untoward event" was posted in the newsrooms of all the British exchanges. All commercial securities went down, while the price of saltpeter went up. Consols<sup>1</sup> declined three-quarters of one per cent, while at Lloyd's war risks of five guineas were demanded on vessels from New York. Late in the evening the wildest rumors circulated in London, to the effect that the American Minister<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> British government securities.

<sup>2</sup> Charles Francis Adams.



had forthwith been sent his passports, that orders had been issued for the immediate seizure of all American ships in the ports of the United Kingdom, and so forth. The cotton friends of secession at Liverpool improved the opportunity for holding, at ten minutes' notice, in the cotton salesroom of the Stock Exchange, an indignation meeting, under the presidency of Mr. Spence, the author of some obscure pamphlet in the interest of the Southern Confederacy. Commodore Williams, the Admiralty Agent on board the *Trent*, who had arrived with the *La Plata*, was at once summoned to London.

On the following day, the 28th of November, the London press exhibited, on the whole, a tone of moderation strangely contrasting with the tremendous political and mercantile excitement of the previous evening. The Palmerston papers, *The Times*, *Morning Post*, *Daily Telegraph*, *Morning Advertiser*, and *Sun*, had received orders to calm down rather than to exasperate. *The Daily News*, by its strictures on the conduct of the *San Jacinto*, evidently aimed less at hitting the Federal government than clearing itself of the suspicion of "Yankee prejudices," while *The Morning Star*, John Bright's organ, without passing any judgment on the policy and wisdom of the "act," pleaded its lawfulness. There were only two exceptions to the general tenor of the London press. The Tory scribblers of *The Morning Herald* and *The Standard*, forming in fact one paper under different names, gave full vent to their savage satisfaction of having at last caught the "republicans" in a trap, and finding a *casus belli*, ready cut out. They were supported by but one other journal, *The Morning Chronicle*, which for years had tried to prolong its checkered existence by alternately selling itself to the poisoner Palmer and the Tuileries. The excitement of the Exchange greatly subsided in consequence of the pacific tone of the leading London papers. On the same 28th of November, Commander Williams attended at the Admiralty and reported the circumstances of the occurrence in the Old Bahama Channel. His report, together with the written deposi-

tions of the officers on board the *Trent*, were at once submitted to the law officers of the Crown, whose opinion, late in the evening, was officially brought to the notice of Lord Palmerston, Earl Russell, and other members of the government.

On the 29th of November there was to be remarked some slight change in the tone of the ministerial press. It became known that the law officers of the Crown, on a technical ground, had declared the proceedings of the frigate *San Jacinto* illegal, and that later in the day the Cabinet, summoned to a general council, had decided to send by next steamer to Lord Lyons instructions to conform to the opinion of the English law officers. Hence the excitement in the principal places of business, such as the Stock Exchange, Lloyd's, the Jerusalem, the Baltic, etc., set in with redoubled force, and was further stimulated by the news that the projected shipments to America of saltpeter had been stopped on the previous day, and that on the 29th a general order was received at the Customs House prohibiting the exportation of this article to any country except under certain stringent conditions. The English funds further fell three-quarters, and at one time a real panic prevailed in all the stock markets, it having become impossible to transact any business in some securities, while in all descriptions a severe depression of prices occurred. In the afternoon a recovery in the stock market was due to several rumors, but principally to the report that Mr. Adams had expressed his opinion that the act of the *San Jacinto* would be disavowed by the Washington Cabinet.

On the 30th of November (today) all the London papers, with the single exception of *The Morning Star*, put the alternative of reparation by the Washington Cabinet or—war.

Having summed up the history of the events from the arrival of the *La Plata* to the present day, I shall now proceed to recording opinions. There were, of course, two points to be considered—on the one hand the law, on the other hand

the policy, of the seizure of the Southern Commissioners on board an English mail steamer.

As to the legal aspect of the affair, the first difficulty mooted by the Tory press and *The Morning Chronicle* was that the United States had never recognized the Southern secessionists as belligerents, and, consequently, could not claim belligerent rights in regard to them.

This quibble was at once disposed of by the ministerial press itself. "We," said *The Times*, "have already recognized these Confederate States as a belligerent power, and we shall, when the time comes, recognize their government. Therefore we have imposed on ourselves all the duties and inconveniences of a power neutral between two belligerents." Hence, whether or not the United States recognize the Confederates as belligerents they have the right to insist upon England submitting to all the duties and inconveniences of a neutral in maritime warfare.

Consequently, with the exceptions mentioned, the whole London press acknowledges the right of the *San Jacinto* to overhaul, visit, and search the *Trent*, in order to ascertain whether she carried goods or persons belonging to the category of "contraband of war." *The Times* insinuation that the English law of decisions "was given *under circumstances very different from* those which now occur"; that "steamers did not then exist, and mail vessels, carrying letters wherein all the nations of the world have immediate interest, were unknown"; that "we (the English) were *fighting for existence*, and did in those days *what we should not* allow others to *do*," was not seriously thrown out. Palmerston's private *Moniteur*, the *Morning Post*, declared on the same day that mail steamers were simple merchantmen, not sharing the exemption from the right of search of men-of-war and transports. The *right of search*, on the part of the *San Jacinto*, was in point of fact conceded by the London press as well as the law officers of the Crown. The objection that the *Trent*, in-

stead of sailing from a belligerent to a belligerent port, was, on the contrary, bound from a neutral to a neutral port, fell to the ground by Lord Stowell's decision that the right of search is intended to ascertain the destination of a ship.

In the second instance, the question arose whether by firing a round shot across the bows of the *Trent*, and subsequently throwing a shell, bursting close to her, the *San Jacinto* had not violated the usage and courtesies appurtenant to the exercise of the right of visitation and search. It was generally conceded by the London press that, since the details of the event have till now been only ascertained by the depositions of one of the parties concerned, no such minor question could influence the decision to be arrived at by the British government.

The right of search exercised by the *San Jacinto* thus being conceded, what had she to look for? For *contraband of war*, presumed to be conveyed by the *Trent*. What is contraband of war? Are the *dispatches* of the belligerent government contraband of war? Are the persons carrying those dispatches contraband of war? And, both questions being answered in the affirmative, do those dispatches and the bearers of them continue to be contraband of war if found on a merchant ship bound from a neutral port to a neutral port? The London press admits that the decisions of the highest legal authorities on both sides of the Atlantic are so contradictory, and may be claimed with such appearance of justice for both the affirmative and the negative, that, at all events, a *prima facie* case is made out for the *San Jacinto*.

Concurrently with this prevalent opinion of the English press, the English Crown lawyers have altogether dropped the material question, and only taken up the formal question. They assert that the law of nations was not violated in *substance* but in *form* only. They have arrived at the conclusion that the *San Jacinto* failed in seizing, on her own responsibility, the Southern Commissioners, instead of taking the *Trent* to a Federal port and submitting the question to a Federal

Prize Court, no armed cruiser having a right to make itself a judge at sea. A violation in the *procedure* of the *San Jacinto* is, therefore, all that is imputed to her by the English Crown lawyers, who, in my opinion, are right in their conclusion. It might be easy to unearth precedents, showing England to have similarly trespassed on the formalities of maritime law, but violations of law can never be allowed to supplant the law itself.

The question may now be mooted whether the reparation demanded by the English government—that is, the restitution of the Southern Commissioners—be warranted by an injury which the English themselves avow to be of *form* rather than of *substance*? A lawyer of the Temple, in today's *Times*, remarks, in respect to this point:

If the case is not so clearly in our favor as that a decision in the American Court condemning the vessel would have been liable to be questioned by us as manifestly contrary to the laws of nations, then the irregularity of the American captain in allowing the *Trent* to proceed to Southampton, clearly redounded to the advantage of the British owners and the British passengers. Could we in such case find a ground of international quarrel in an error of procedure which in effect told in our own favor?

Still, if the American government must concede, as it seems to me, that Captain Wilkes has committed a violation of maritime law, whether formal or material, their fair fame and their interest ought alike to prevent them from nibbling at the terms of the satisfaction to be given to the injured party. They ought to remember that they do the work of the secessionists in embroiling the United States in a war with England, that such a war would be a godsend to Louis Bonaparte in his present difficulties, and would, consequently, be supported by all the official weight of France; and, lastly, that, what with the actual force under the command of the British on the North American and West Indian stations,

what with the forces of the Mexican expedition, the English government would have at its disposal an overwhelming maritime power.

As to the policy of the seizure in the Bahama Channel, the voice not only of the English, but of the European press is unanimous in expressions of bewilderment at the strange conduct of the American government, provoking such tremendous international dangers, for gaining the bodies of Messrs. Mason, Slidell, & Co., while Messrs. Yancey and Mann are strutting in London. *The Times* is certainly right in saying:

Even Mr. Seward himself must know that the voices of these Southern Commissioners, sounding from their captivity, are a thousand times more eloquent in London and in Paris than they would have been if they had been heard at St. James and the Tuileries.

The people of the United States, having magnanimously submitted to a curtailment of their own liberties in order to save their country, will certainly be no less ready to turn the tide of popular opinion in England by openly avowing, and carefully making up for, an international blunder the vindication of which might realize the boldest hopes of the rebels.

(Marx)

## **Progress of Feeling in England**

---

*Dated December 7, 1861 / Published December 25, 1861*

The friends of the United States on this side of the Atlantic anxiously hope that conciliatory steps will be taken by the Federal government. They do so not from a concurrence in the frantic crowing of the British press over a war incident, which, according to the English Crown lawyers themselves, resolves itself into a mere error of procedure, and may be summed up in the words that there has been a breach of international law because Captain Wilkes, instead of taking the *Trent*, her cargo, her passengers, and the Commissioners, did only take the Commissioners. Nor springs the anxiety of the well-wishers of the Great Republic from an apprehension lest, in the long run, it should not prove able to cope with England, although backed by the civil war; and least of all do they expect the United States to abdicate, even for a mo-

ment, and in a dark hour of trial, the proud position held by them in the council of nations. The motives that prompt them are of quite a different nature.

In the first instance, the business next in hand for the United States is to crush the rebellion and to restore the Union. The wish uppermost in the minds of the slavocracy and their Northern tools was always to plunge the United States into a war with England. The first step of England as soon as hostilities broke out would be to recognize the Southern Confederacy, and the second to terminate the blockade. Secondly, no general, if not forced, will accept battle at the time and under the conditions chosen by his enemy. "A war with America," says *The Economist*, a paper deeply in Palmerston's confidence, "must always be one of the most lamentable incidents in the history of England, but if it is to happen, *the present is certainly the period at which it will do us the minimum of harm, and the only moment in our joint annals at which it would confer on us an incidental and partial compensation.*" The very reason accounting for the eagerness of England to seize upon any decent pretext for war at this "only moment" ought to withhold the United States from forwarding such a pretext at this "only moment." You go not to war with the aim to do your enemy "*the minimum of harm,*" and, even to confer upon him by the war, "*an incidental and partial compensation.*" The opportunity of the moment would all be on one side, on the side of your foe. Is there any great strain of reasoning wanted to prove that an internal war raging in a state is the least opportune time for entering upon a foreign war? At every other moment the mercantile classes of Great Britain would have looked upon the war against the United States with the utmost horror. Now, on the contrary, a large and influential party of the mercantile community has for months been urging on the government to violently break the blockade, and thus provide the main branch of British industry with its raw material. The fear of a curtailment of the English export trade to the United



States has lost its sting by the curtailment of that trade having already actually occurred. "They" (the Northern States), says *The Economist*, "are wretched customers, instead of good ones." The vast credit usually given by English commerce to the United States, principally by the acceptance of bills drawn from China and India, has been already reduced to scarcely a fifth of what it was in 1857. Last, not least, Decembrist France, bankrupt, paralyzed at home, beset with difficulty abroad, pounces upon an Anglo-American war as a real godsend, and, in order to buy English support in Europe, will strain all her power to support "Perfidious Albion" on the other side of the Atlantic. Read only the French newspapers. The pitch of indignation to which they have wrought themselves in their tender care for the "honor of England," their fierce diatribes as to the necessity on the part of England to revenge the outrage on the Union Jack, their vile denunciations of everything American, would be truly appalling, if they were not ridiculous and disgusting at the same time. Lastly, if the United States give way in this instance, they will not derogate one iota of their dignity. England has reduced her complaint to a mere *error of procedure*, a *technical blunder* of which she has made herself systematically guilty in all her maritime wars, but against which the United States have never ceased to protest, and which President Madison, in his message inaugurating the war of 1812, expatiated upon as one of the most shocking breaches of international law. If the United States may be defended in paying England with her own coin, will they be accused for magnanimously disavowing, on the part of a single American captain, acting on his own responsibility, what they always denounced as a systematic usurpation on the part of the British Navy! In point of fact, the gain of such a procedure would be all on the American side. England, on the one hand, would have acknowledged the right of the United States to capture and bring to adjudication before an American prize court every English ship employed in the service of the Con-

federacy. On the other hand, she would, once for all, before the eyes of the whole world, have practically resigned a claim which she was not brought to desist from either in the Peace of Ghent in 1814 or the transactions carried on between Lord Ashburton and Secretary Webster in 1842. The question then comes to this: Do you prefer to turn the "untoward event" to your own account, or, blinded by the passions of the moment, turn it to the account of your foes at home and abroad?

Since this day week, when I sent you my last letter, British consols have again lowered, the decline, compared with last Friday, amounting to two per cent, the present prices being 89¼ to ¾ for money and to 90 to ¼ for the new account on the 9th of January. This quotation corresponds to the quotation of the British consols during the first two years of the Anglo-Russian War. This decline is altogether due to the warlike interpretation put upon the American papers conveyed by the last mail, to the exacerbating tone of the London press, whose moderation of two days' standing was but a feint, ordered by Palmerston, to the dispatch of troops for Canada, to the proclamation forbidding the export of arms and materials for gunpowder, and lastly, to the daily ostentatious statements concerning the formidable preparations for war in the docks and maritime arsenals.

Of one thing you may be sure, Palmerston wants a legal pretext for a war with the United States, but meets in the Cabinet councils with a most determinate opposition on the part of Messrs. Gladstone and Milner-Gibson, and, to a less degree, of Sir Cornwall Lewis. "The noble viscount" is backed by Russell, an abject tool in his hands, and the whole Whig coterie. If the Washington Cabinet should furnish the desired pretext, the present Cabinet will be sprung, to be supplanted by a Tory administration. The preliminary steps for such a change of scenery have been already settled between Palmerston and Disraeli. Hence the furious war cry of *The Morning Herald* and *The Standard*, those hungry wolves

howling at the prospect of the long missed crumbs from the public almoner.

Palmerston's designs may be shown up by calling into memory a few facts. It was he who insisted upon the proclamation acknowledging the secessionists as belligerents, on the morning of the 14th of May, after he had been informed by telegraph from Liverpool that Mr. Adams would arrive at London on the night of the 13th May. He, after a severe struggle with his colleagues, dispatched 3,000 men to Canada, an army ridiculous if intended to cover a frontier of 1,500 miles, but a clever sleight-of-hand if the rebellion was to be cheered and the Union to be irritated. He, many weeks ago, urged Bonaparte to propose a joint armed intervention "in the internecine struggle," supported that project in the Cabinet council, and failed only in carrying it by the resistance of his colleagues. He and Bonaparte then resorted to the Mexican intervention as a *pis aller*. That operation served two purposes, by provoking just resentment on the part of the Americans, and by simultaneously furnishing a pretext for the dispatch of a squadron, ready, as the *Morning Post* has it, "to perform whatever duty the hostile conduct of the government of Washington may require us to perform in the waters of the Northern Atlantic." At the time when that expedition was started, the *Morning Post*, together with *The Times* and the smaller fry of Palmerston's press slaves, said that it was a very fine thing, and a philanthropic thing into the bargain, because it would expose the slaveholding Confederacy to two fires—the antislavery North and the antislavery force of England and France. And what says the very same *Morning Post*, this curious compound of Jenkins and Rodomonte, of plush and swash, in its today's issue, on occasion of Jefferson Davis's address? Harken to the Palmerston oracle:

We must look to this intervention as one that may be inoperative during a considerable period of time; and while the

Northern government is too distant to admit of its attitude entering materially into this question, the Southern Confederacy, on the other hand, stretches for a great distance along the frontier of Mexico, so as to render its friendly disposition to the authors of the insurrection of no slight consequence. The Northern government has invariably railed at our neutrality, but the Southern with statesmanship and moderation has recognized in it all that we could do for either party; and whether with a view to our transactions in Mexico, or to our relations with the Cabinet at Washington, the *friendly forbearance* of the Southern Confederacy is an important point in our favor.

I may remark that the *Nord* of December 3—a Russian paper, and consequently a paper initiated into Palmerston's designs—insinuates that the Mexican expedition was from the first set on foot, not for its ostensible purpose, but for a war against the United States.

Gen. Scott's letter<sup>1</sup> had produced such a beneficent reaction in public opinion, and even on the London Stock Exchange, that the conspirators of Downing Street and the Tuileries found it necessary to let loose the *Patrie*, stating with all the airs of knowledge derived from official sources that the seizure of the Southern Commissioners from the *Trent* was directly authorized by the Washington Cabinet.

(Marx)

<sup>1</sup> General Winfield Scott, who was in Paris at the time the news of the *Trent* affair reached Europe, expressed the opinion that the seizure of the Southern Commissioners could not have been authorized by the Federal government. "I am sure," he wrote, "that the President and the people of the United States would be but too happy to let these men go . . . if by it they could emancipate the commerce of the world."

## English Public Opinion

---

*Dated January 11, 1862 / Published February 1, 1862*

The news of the pacific solution of the *Trent* conflict was, by the bulk of the English people, saluted with an exultation proving unmistakably the unpopularity of the apprehended war and the dread of its consequences. It ought never to be forgotten in the United States that at least the *working classes* of England, from the commencement to the termination of the difficulty, have never forsaken them. To them it was due that, despite the poisonous stimulants daily administered by a venal and reckless press, not one single public war meeting could be held in the United Kingdom during all the period that peace trembled in the balance. The only war meeting convened on the arrival of the *La Plata*, in the cotton salesroom of the Liverpool Stock Exchange, was a corner meeting where the cotton jobbers had it all to themselves.

Even at Manchester, the temper of the working classes was so well understood that an isolated attempt at the convocation of a war meeting was almost as soon abandoned as thought of.

Wherever public meetings took place in England, Scotland, or Ireland,<sup>1</sup> they protested against the rabid war cries of the press, against the sinister designs of the government, and declared for a pacific settlement of the pending question. In this regard, the two last meetings held, the one at Paddington, London, the other at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, are characteristic. The former meeting applauded Mr. Washington Wilkes' argumentation that England was not warranted in finding fault with the seizure of the Southern Commissioners; while the Newcastle meeting almost unanimously carried the resolution—firstly, that the Americans had only made themselves guilty of a *lawful* exercise of the right of search and seizure; secondly, that the captain of the *Trent* ought to be punished for his violation of English neutrality, as proclaimed by the Queen. In ordinary circumstances, the conduct of the British workingmen might have been anticipated from the natural sympathy the popular classes all over the world ought to feel for the only popular government in the world.

Under the present circumstances, however, when a great portion of the British working classes directly and severely suffers under the consequences of the Southern blockade; when another part is indirectly smitten by the curtailment of the American commerce, owing, as they are told, to the selfish "protective policy" of the Republicans; when the only remaining democratic weekly, Reynolds' paper, has sold itself to Messrs. Yancey and Mann and week after week exhausts its horsepowers of foul language in appeals to the working classes to urge the government, for their own inter-

<sup>1</sup> For example, in Dublin 5,000 people gathered to cheer a speaker who openly asserted that if England were to declare war on the United States, Ireland would gladly fight on the American side.

ests, to war with the Union—under such circumstances, simple justice requires to pay a tribute to the sound attitude of the British working classes, the more so when contrasted with the hypocritical, bullying, cowardly, and stupid conduct of the official and well-to-do John Bull.

What a difference in this attitude of the people from what it had assumed at the time of the Russian complication! Then *The Times*, the [*Morning*] *Post*, and the other yellow plushes of the London press, whined for peace, to be rebuked by tremendous war meetings all over the country. Now they have howled for war, to be answered by peace meetings denouncing the liberticide schemes and the pro-slavery sympathy of the government. The grimaces cut by the augurs of public opinion at the news of the pacific solution of the *Trent* case are really amusing.

In the first place, they must needs congratulate themselves upon the dignity, common sense, good will, and moderation daily displayed by them for the whole interval of a month. They *were* moderate for the first two days after the arrival of the *La Plata*, when Palmerston felt uneasy whether any legal pretext for a quarrel was to be picked. But hardly had the Crown lawyers hit upon a legal quibble, when they opened a charivari unheard of since the anti-Jacobin war. The dispatches of the English government left Queenstown in the beginning of December. No official answer from Washington could possibly be looked for before the commencement of January. The new incidents arising in the interval told all in favor of the Americans. The tone of the trans-Atlantic press, although the *Nashville* affair<sup>2</sup> might have roused its passions, was calm. All facts ascertained concurred to show that Captain Wilkes had acted on his own hook. The position of the Washington government was delicate. If it resisted the English demands, it would complicate the civil war by a for-

<sup>2</sup> In the autumn of 1861 the Confederate privateer *Nashville*, with a cargo of \$3,000,000 in war booty, was allowed to enter Southampton harbor and to unload. This clearly violated England's neutrality.

eign war. If it gave way, it might damage its popularity at home, and appear to cede to pressure from abroad. And the government thus placed, carried, at the same time, a war which must enlist the warmest sympathies of every man, not a confessed ruffian, on its side.

Common prudence, conventional decency, ought, therefore, to have dictated to the London press, at least for the time separating the English demand from the American reply, to abstain anxiously from every word calculated to heat passion, breed ill-will, complicate the difficulty. But no! That "inexpressibly mean and groveling" press, as William Cobbett, and he was a *connoisseur*, calls it, really boasted of having, when in fear of the compact power of the United States, humbly submitted to the accumulated slights and insults of proslavery administration for almost half a century, while now, with the savage exultation of cowards, they panted for taking their revenge on the Republican administration, distracted by a civil war. The record of mankind chronicles no self-avowed infamy like this.

One of the yellow-plushes, Palmerston's private *Moniteur*—the *Morning Post*—finds itself arraigned on a most ugly charge from the American papers. John Bull has never been informed—on information carefully withheld from him by the oligarchs that lord it over him—that Mr. Seward, without awaiting Russell's dispatch, had disavowed any participation of the Washington Cabinet in the act of Captain Wilkes. Mr. Seward's dispatch arrived at London on December 19. On the 20th December the rumor of this "secret" spread on the Stock Exchange. On the 21st, the yellow-plush of the *Morning Post* stepped forward to herald gravely that "the dispatch in question does not in any way whatever refer to the outrage on our mail packet."

In *The Daily News*, *The Morning Star*, and other London journals, you will find yellow-plush pretty sharply handled, but you will not learn from them what people out of doors say. They say that the *Morning Post* and *The Times*, like the



*Patrie* and the *Pays*, dupe the public not only to mislead them politically, but to fleece them in the monetary line on the Stock Exchange, in the interest of their patrons.

The brazen *Times*, fully aware that during the whole crisis it had compromised nobody but itself, and given another proof of the hollowness of its pretensions of influencing the real people of England, plays today a trick which here, at London, only works upon the laughing muscles, but on the other side of the Atlantic might be misinterpreted. The "popular classes" of London, the "mob," as the yellow-plush call them, have given unmistakable signs—have even hinted in newspapers—that they should consider it an exceedingly seasonable joke to treat Mason (by the bye, a distant relative of Palmerston, since the original Mason had married a daughter of Sir W. Temple), Slidell, & Co. with the same demonstrations Hainau received on his visit at Barclay's brewery.<sup>3</sup> *The Times* stands aghast at the mere idea of such a shocking incident, and how does it try to parry it? It admonishes the people of England not to overwhelm Mason, Slidell, & Co. with any sort of public ovation. *The Times* knows that its article of today will form the laughingstock of all the taprooms of London. But never mind! People on the other side of the Atlantic may, perhaps, fancy that the magnanimity of *The Times* has saved them from the affront of public ovation to Mason, Slidell, & Co., while, in point of fact, *The Times* only intends saving those gentlemen from public insult!

So long as the *Trent* affair was undecided, *The Times*, the [Morning] *Post*, *The [Morning] Herald*, *The Economist*, *The Saturday Review*, in fact the whole of the fashionable hireling press of London, had tried its utmost to persuade John Bull that the Washington government, even if it willed, would prove unable to keep the peace, because the Yankee mob would not allow it, and because the Federal govern-

<sup>3</sup> In 1850, Hainau, the reactionary Austrian general, was beaten by an angry mob of London workers.

ment was a mob government. Facts have now given them the lie direct. Do they now atone for their malignant slanders against the American people? Do they at least confess the error which yellow-plush, in presuming to judge of the acts of a free people, could not but commit? By no means. They now unanimously discover that the American government, in not anticipating England's demands, and not surrendering the Southern traitors as soon as they were caught, missed a great occasion, and deprived its present concession of all merit. Indeed, yellow-plush! Mr. Seward disavowed the act of Wilkes before the arrival of the English demands, and at once declared himself willing to enter upon a conciliatory course; and what did you do on similar occasions? When, on the pretext of impressing English sailors on board American ships—a pretext not at all connected with maritime belligerent rights, but a downright, monstrous usurpation against all international law—the *Leopard* fired its broadside at the *Chesapeake*, killed six, wounded twenty-one of her sailors, and seized the pretended Englishmen on board the *Chesapeake*, what did the English government do? That outrage was perpetrated on the 22nd of June, 1807. The real satisfaction, the surrender of the sailors, etc., was only offered on November 8, 1812, five years later. The British government, it is true, disavowed at once the act of Admiral Berkeley, as Mr. Seward did in regard to Captain Wilkes; but, to punish the Admiral, it removed him from an inferior to a superior rank. England, in proclaiming her Orders in Council,<sup>4</sup> distinctly confessed that they were outrages on the rights of neutrals in general, and of the United States in particular; that they were forced upon her as measures of retaliation

<sup>4</sup> The Orders in Council, issued in 1807, had declared that all ships trading with France or her allies were liable to capture. The Orders were opposed with special vehemence by the United States on the grounds that they were an infringement of her neutral rights. They were suspended on June 23, 1812, five days after the U.S. declaration of war which they helped to provoke.

against Napoleon, and that she would feel but too glad to revoke them whenever Napoleon should revoke his encroachments on neutral rights. Napoleon did revoke them, as far as the United States were concerned, in the spring of 1810. England persisted in her avowed outrage on the maritime rights of America. Her resistance lasted from 1806 to 23rd of June, 1812—after, on the 18th of June, the United States had declared war against England. England abstained, consequently, in this case for six years, not from atoning for a confessed outrage, but from discounting it. And this people talk of the magnificent occasion missed by the American government! Whether in the wrong or in the right, it was a cowardly act on the part of the British government to back a complaint grounded on pretended technical blunder, and a mere error of procedure, by an ultimatum, by a demand for the surrender of the prisoners. The American government might have reasons to accede to that demand; it could have none to anticipate it.

By the present settlement of the *Trent* collision, the question underlying the whole dispute, and likely to again occur—the belligerent rights of a maritime power against neutrals—has not been settled. I shall, with your permission, try to survey the whole question in a subsequent letter. For the present, allow me to add that, in my opinion, Messrs. Mason and Slidell have done great service to the Federal government. There was an influential war party in England, which, what for commercial, what for political reasons, showed itself eager for a fray with the United States. The *Trent* affair put that party to the test. It has failed. The war passion has been discontented on a minor issue, the steam has been let off, the vociferous fury of the oligarchy has raised the suspicions of English democracy, the large British interests connected with the United States have made a stand, the true character of the civil war has been brought home to the working classes, and last, not least, the dangerous period when Pal-

merston rules single-handed without being checked by Parliament is rapidly drawing to an end. That was the only time in which an English war for the slavocrats might have been hazarded. It is now out of question.

(Marx)

## (Appendix)

---

*List of Marx/Engels Articles in The New York  
Daily Tribune, prepared by Louis Lazarus.*

*Note:* Articles marked (FE) are by Engels; those marked (M/E) are by Marx and Engels. All others are by Marx.

An asterisk (\*) after the title indicates that the article is not included in the *Werke*.

### 1851

|                                                    |         |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------|
| (Germany at the Outbreak of the Revolution) (F.E.) | Oct. 25 |
| (The Prussian State) (F.E.)                        | Oct. 28 |
| (The Other German States) (F.E.)                   | Nov. 6  |
| (Austria) (F.E.)                                   | Nov. 7  |
| (The Vienna Insurrection) (F.E.)                   | Nov. 12 |

### 1852

|                                                  |          |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------|
| (The Frankfort National Assembly) (F.E.)         | Feb. 27  |
| (Poles, Czechs, and Germans) (F.E.)              | March 5  |
| (Panslavism—The Schleswig-Holstein War) (F.E.)   | March 15 |
| (The Paris Rising—The Frankfort Assembly) (F.E.) | March 18 |
| (The Vienna Insurrection) (F.E.)                 | March 19 |

|                                                                       |          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| (The Storming of Vienna—Betrayal of Vienna) (F.E.)                    | April 9  |
| (The Prussian Assembly—The National Assembly) (F.E.)                  | April 17 |
| (The Restoration of Order—Diet and Chamber) (F.E.)                    | April 24 |
| (The Triumph of Prussia) (F.E.)                                       | July 27  |
| (The Assembly and the Governments) (F.E.)                             | Aug. 19  |
| The Elections in England—Tories and Whigs                             | Aug. 21  |
| The Chartists                                                         | Aug. 25  |
| Corruption at Elections                                               | Sept. 4  |
| Results of the Elections                                              | Sept. 11 |
| (Insurrection) (F.E.)                                                 | Sept. 18 |
| (Petty Traders) (F.E.)                                                | Oct. 2   |
| Movement of Mazzini and Kossuth—League with Louis Napoleon—Palmerston | Oct. 19  |
| (The Close of the Insurrection) (F.E.)                                | Oct. 23  |
| Pauperism and Free Trade—The Approaching Commercial Crisis            | Nov. 1   |
| Political Consequences of the Commercial Excitement                   | Nov. 2   |
| (Efforts to Establish a New Opposition Party)                         | Nov. 25  |
| Political Parties and Prospects                                       | Nov. 29  |
| Kossuth, Mazzini and Louis Napoleon                                   | Dec. 1   |
| The Communist Trial in Cologne (F.E.)                                 | Dec. 22  |
| Parliament—Vote of November 26—Disraeli's Budget                      | Dec. 28  |

## 1853

|                                                                                                        |          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| A Reply to Kossuth's Secretary                                                                         | Jan. 4   |
| The Defeat of the Ministry                                                                             | Jan. 7   |
| A Superannuated Administration—Projects of the Coalition Ministry                                      | Jan. 28  |
| Political Prospects—Commercial Prosperity—Case of Starvation                                           | Feb. 2   |
| Elections—Financial Clouds—The Duchess of Sutherland                                                   | Feb. 9   |
| Capital Punishment—Mr. Cobden's Pamphlet—Regulations of the Bank of England                            | Feb. 18  |
| Defense—Finances—Decrease of the Aristocracy—Politics                                                  | Feb. 23  |
| The Italian Insurrection—British Politics                                                              | Feb. 25  |
| The Attack on Francis Joseph—The Milan Riot—British Politics—Disraeli's Speech—Napoleon's Will         | March 8  |
| Parliamentary Debates—The Clergy and the Struggle for the Ten Hour Day—Starvation                      | March 15 |
| Forced Emigration—Kossuth and Mazzini—The Refugee Question—Election Bribery in England—Mr. Cobden      | March 22 |
| (Kossuth and Mazzini—The Prussian Police—Trade Between Austria and Prussia—The "Times" and Emigration) | April 4  |
| British Policy—Disraeli—The Refugees—Mazzini in London—Turkey (M/E)                                    | April 7  |
| The London Press—Policy of Napoleon on the Turkish Question                                            | April 11 |
| The Real Issue in Turkey (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                       | April 12 |
| The Berlin Conspiracy                                                                                  | April 18 |
| The Turkish Question (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                           | April 19 |
| The Berlin Conspiracy—London Police—Mazzini—Radetsky                                                   | April 21 |

|                                                                                                                                           |          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| What is to Become of Turkey in Europe? (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                            | April 21 |
| Achievements of the Ministry                                                                                                              | April 27 |
| Feargus O'Connor—Ministerial Defeats—The Budget                                                                                           | May 3    |
| Riot at Constantinople—German Table-Moving—The Budget                                                                                     | May 6    |
| The Rocket Affair—The Swiss Insurrection (M/E)                                                                                            | May 14   |
| The Political Position of the Swiss Republic (F.E.)                                                                                       | May 17   |
| Affairs in Holland—Denmark—Conversion of the British Debt—<br>India—Turkey and Russia                                                     | June 9   |
| Mazzini—Switzerland and Austria—The Turkish Question                                                                                      | June 10  |
| Revolution in China and Europe <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                           | June 14  |
| Turkish Question—The "Times"—Russian Aggrandizement                                                                                       | June 14  |
| The Russian Humbug—Gladstone's Failure—Sir Charles Woods'<br>East Indian Reforms                                                          | June 22  |
| Parliamentary Debates On India*                                                                                                           | June 24  |
| The British Rule in India                                                                                                                 | June 25  |
| English Prosperity—Strikes—The Turkish Question—India                                                                                     | July 1   |
| Turkey and Russia—Connivance of the Aberdeen Ministry with<br>Russia—The Budget—Tax on Newspaper Supplements—<br>Parliamentary Corruption | July 8   |
| The East India Company—Its History and Results                                                                                            | July 11  |
| The Indian Question—Irish Tenant Rights                                                                                                   | July 11  |
| Russian Policy Against Turkey—The Labor Movement in Eng-<br>land                                                                          | July 14  |
| The Turkish War Question—The New York Tribune in the<br>House of Commons—The Government of India                                          | July 20  |
| (The Crisis in the East—The Struggle for the Ten Hour Bill)                                                                               | July 22  |
| The Russo-Turkish Difficulty—Ducking and Dodging of the<br>British Cabinet—Nesselrode's Latest Note—The Native<br>States (M/E)            | July 25  |
| War in Burma—The Russian Question—Curious Diplomatic<br>Correspondence                                                                    | July 30  |
| The War Question—Doings of Parliament—India                                                                                               | Aug. 5   |
| The Future Results of British Rule in India                                                                                               | Aug. 8   |
| Financial Failure of Government—Cabs—Ireland—The Rus-<br>sian Question                                                                    | Aug. 12  |
| (The Press on Eastern Affairs—Notes of England and Russia)                                                                                | Aug. 16  |
| Advertisement Duty—Russian Movement—Denmark—United<br>States in Europe                                                                    | Aug. 19  |
| The War Question—British Population and Trade Returns—<br>Doings of Parliament                                                            | Aug. 24  |
| The Turkish Question in the Commons                                                                                                       | Sept. 2  |
| Urquart—Bem—The Turkish Question in the House of Lords                                                                                    | Sept. 2  |
| Affairs Continental and English                                                                                                           | Sept. 5  |
| Rise in the Price of Corn—Cholera—Strikes—Sailors' Move-<br>ment                                                                          | Sept. 15 |
| (The Vienna Note—Letter to Schumla—U.S.A. and Europe—<br>Robert Peel's Bank Act)                                                          | Sept. 24 |
| Political Movements—Scarcity of Bread in Europe                                                                                           | Sept. 30 |
| (The Western Powers and Turkey—Economic Crisis)                                                                                           | Oct. 4   |
| (The Western Powers and Turkey—Economic Crisis)                                                                                           | Oct. 7   |
| (Panic in the London Stock Exchange—Strikes)                                                                                              | Oct. 17  |

|                                                                                                                                                   |         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| The Russians in Turkey (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                                    | Oct. 17 |
| The War Question—Financial Matter—Strikes                                                                                                         | Oct. 21 |
| (The Turkish Manifesto—The Economic Condition in France)                                                                                          | Oct. 31 |
| (The Northern Powers)                                                                                                                             | Nov. 5  |
| The Movements of the Armies in Turkey (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                     | Nov. 8  |
| The Holy War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                                              | Nov. 15 |
| War—Strikes—Dearth                                                                                                                                | Nov. 15 |
| (The Persian Campaign in Afghanistan and the Russian Campaign in Central Asia—Denmark—War on the Danube and in Asia)                              | Nov. 18 |
| The Progress of the Turkish War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                           | Nov. 25 |
| The Labor Question                                                                                                                                | Nov. 28 |
| The Russian Defeats (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                                       | Nov. 28 |
| Prosperity—The Labor Question                                                                                                                     | Nov. 30 |
| Progress of the War (F.E.)                                                                                                                        | Dec. 7  |
| (Manteuffel's Speech—The Religious Movements in Prussia, Mazzini's Address—The London Municipal Council—Russell's Reform—The Parliament of Labor) | Dec. 12 |
| The Turkish War—Industrial Distress                                                                                                               | Dec. 16 |
| The War on the Danube (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                                     | Dec. 16 |
| The Quadruple Convention—England and the War                                                                                                      | Dec. 26 |
| The Russian Victory—The Position of England and France                                                                                            | Dec. 27 |

### Lord Palmerston

|                                                                                                                                       |               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Articles I and II                                                                                                                     | Oct. 19, 1853 |
| Article III                                                                                                                           | Nov. 4, 1853  |
| Articles IV and V                                                                                                                     | Nov. 21, 1853 |
| Article VII                                                                                                                           | Jan. 11, 1854 |
| (This series also appeared in "The People's Paper" in London, but in 8 articles. In the NYDT, articles VI and VIII were not included) |               |

### 1853

|                          |         |
|--------------------------|---------|
| Russian Policy*          | Dec. 30 |
| Palmerston's Resignation | Dec. 31 |

### 1854

|                                                                                                                     |         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Progress of the Turkish War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                 | Jan. 9  |
| (The Western Powers and Turkey)                                                                                     | Jan. 28 |
| The European War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                            | Feb. 2  |
| The Last Battle in Europe (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                   | Feb. 8  |
| (The War in the Orient—Austrian and French Finances—The Fortifications of Constantinople)                           | Feb. 8  |
| (The Czar's Views—Prince Albert)                                                                                    | Feb. 11 |
| (The Fortification of Constantinople—Danish Neutrality—The State of the English Parliament—Poverty in Europe) (M/E) | Feb. 16 |
| (The Mission of Count Orlov—Russian Military Finances—)                                                             | Feb. 20 |
| (The Bluebooks—The Parliamentary Debate of February 6—                                                              |         |



|                                                                                                                             |          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| The Mission of Count Orlov—The Operations of the United Fleet—The Irish Brigade—The Convocation of the Parliament of Labor) | Feb. 21  |
| (Russian Diplomacy—The Blue Book on the Oriental Question—Montenegro)                                                       | Feb. 27  |
| The Question of War in Europe (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                       | March 6  |
| Debates in Parliament                                                                                                       | March 9  |
| (Declaration of the Prussian Cabinet—Napoleon Plans—Prussian Politics) <i>Editorial</i>                                     | March 9  |
| (Parliamentary Debates of February 22—The Dispatch of Pozzo di Borgo—The Policies of the Western Powers)                    | March 13 |
| (The War Plans of France and England—The Greek Insurrection—Spain—China)                                                    | March 18 |
| Austrian Bankruptcy <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                        | March 22 |
| (The Opening of the Parliament of Labor—The English War Budget)                                                             | March 24 |
| The Labor Parliament                                                                                                        | March 29 |
| The Greek Insurrection <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                     | March 29 |
| The Documents of the Partition of Turkey                                                                                    | April 5  |
| The Secret Diplomatic Correspondence                                                                                        | April 11 |
| (War Declared—The History of the Eastern Question)                                                                          | April 15 |
| (The War Debate in Parliament)                                                                                              | April 17 |
| (Russia and the German Powers—The Price of Corn)                                                                            | April 21 |
| The Condition of the Armies of Turkey (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                               | April 28 |
| (The Note of Rachid Pasha—The Italian Press and the Eastern Question)                                                       | May 2    |
| (Greece and Turkey—Turkey and the Western Powers—The Decline of the Grain Market in England)                                | May 6    |
| (The Greek Insurrection—The Polish Emigration—Austro-Prussian Treaty—Documents Concerning Military Preparations in Russia)  | May 15   |
| (Bombardment of Odessa—Greece—The Proclamation of the Prince Donilo-Monteuffel's Address)                                   | May 16   |
| Prussian Policy*                                                                                                            |          |
| (Riazanov attributed the article to Engels, <i>Chronik</i> to Marx. The <i>Werke</i> omitted it)                            | May 19   |
| British Finances                                                                                                            | May 23   |
| (Attack on Sebastopol—Expropriation. . . )                                                                                  | June 2   |
| A Famous Victory (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                    | June 6   |
| The Exploits on the Baltic and Black Seas—Anglo-French System of Operation (F.E.)                                           | June 9   |
| The Present Situation of the English Army—Tactics, Uniform Commissariat, etc. (F.E.)                                        | June 10  |
| (Austro-Prussian Treaty—Parliamentary Debate of May 29)                                                                     | June 12  |
| (The Establishment of a Separate Ministry of War in England—The War on the Danube—The Economic Situation)                   | June 14  |
| (The Resignation of the English Military Administration—Austria—Saint Arnaud)                                               | June 24  |
| The Siege of Silistra (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                               | June 26  |
| The State of the Russian War (M/E) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                         | July 8   |
| The Russian Retreat (M/E) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                  | July 10  |

|                                                                                                                 |                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| The War—Debate in Parliament                                                                                    | July 10           |
| The Russian Failure*                                                                                            | July 11           |
| (The Insurrection of Madrid—The Russian Loan—The Austro-Prussian Demands—Austria and Wallachia)                 | July 19 & July 21 |
| The War on the Danube (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                   | July 25           |
| (The Theatre of War—Italy—Spain—The Russian Note)                                                               | July 28           |
| The English Middle Class <i>Editorial</i>                                                                       | Aug. 1            |
| (The Conference at Vienna—The Austrian Loan—Proclamation of Duke and O'Donnell—Ministerial Crisis in England)   | Aug. 3            |
| The Spanish Revolution—Greece and Turkey                                                                        | Aug. 4            |
| The War Debates in Parliament                                                                                   | Aug. 7            |
| (The Austrian Policy—War Debates in the House of Commons)                                                       | Aug. 9            |
| The Bore of a War (M/E)                                                                                         | Aug. 17           |
| Espartero <i>Editorial</i>                                                                                      | Aug. 19           |
| The Attack on the Russian Forts (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                         | Aug. 21           |
| (The Evacuation of the Danubian Principalities—Events in Spain—The New Danish Constitution—The Chartists)       | Aug. 21           |
| (The Evacuation of Moldavia and Wallachia—Poland—The Demands of the Spanish People)                             | Aug. 25           |
| (The Eastern Question—The Revolution in Spain—Madrid Press)                                                     | Sept. 1           |
| The Capture of Bomarsund (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                | Sept. 4           |
| (The Revolution in Spain—Bomarsund)                                                                             | Sept. 4           |
| The Capture of Bomarsund (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                | Sept. 13          |
| Revolutionary Spain                                                                                             |                   |
| I September 9, 1854                                                                                             |                   |
| II September 25, 1854                                                                                           |                   |
| III October 20, 1854                                                                                            |                   |
| IV October 27, 1854                                                                                             |                   |
| V October 30, 1854                                                                                              |                   |
| VI November 24, 1854                                                                                            |                   |
| VII December 1, 1854                                                                                            |                   |
| VIII December 2, 1854                                                                                           |                   |
| The Reaction in Spain                                                                                           | Sept. 16          |
| (The Imprisonment of Mazzini—Austria—Spain—Wallachia)                                                           | Sept. 30          |
| (The Operations of the Allied Fleet—The Situation in the Danubian Principalities—Spain—England's Foreign Trade) | Oct. 2            |
| The Attack on Sebastopol (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                | Oct. 14           |
| Reports from Crimea (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                     | Oct. 17           |
| The Sebastopol Swindle (M/E) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                   | Oct. 21           |
| The Sebastopol Swindle—General Reports (M/E)                                                                    | Oct. 21           |
| The Battle of Alma (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                      | Oct. 26           |
| The Military Power of Russia (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                            | Oct. 31           |
| The Siege of Sebastopol (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                 | Nov. 15           |
| The Campaign in Crimea (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                  | Nov. 27           |
| The War in the East (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                     | Nov. 30           |
| The Battle at Inkerman (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                  | Dec. 14           |
| The Crimean Campaign (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                                    | Dec. 27           |

## 1855

|                                                          |          |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| The Progress of the War (M/E) <i>Editorial</i>           | Jan. 1   |
| Austria's Military Might (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>         | Jan. 8   |
| The Commercial Crisis in Britain                         | Jan. 26  |
| The European War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                 | Feb. 17  |
| The Fall of the Aberdeen Ministry                        | Feb. 17  |
| The Late British Government (M/E) <i>Editorial</i>       | Feb. 23  |
| The Struggle in the Crimea (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>       | Feb. 26  |
| The War that Looms Over Europe <i>Editorial</i>          | March 8  |
| The Fate of the Great Adventurer (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i> | April 2  |
| The Result in the Crimea (F.E.)                          |          |
| (Translated from the <i>Neue Oder Zeitung</i> by Engels) | April 2  |
| The Battle at Sebastopol (F.E.)                          | April 7  |
| Napoleon's Last Dodge (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>            | April 7  |
| The British Army (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                 | April 14 |
| Progress of the War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>              | April 17 |
| Prospects in France and England                          | April 27 |
| From Sebastopol (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                  | May 28   |
| The Crimean War <i>Editorial</i>                         | June 8   |
| From Crimea (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                      | June 23  |
| Sebastopol (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                       | June 29  |
| Napoleon's War Plan (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>              | July 2   |
| Eccentricities of Politics <i>Editorial</i>              | July 10  |
| From Sebastopol (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                  | July 12  |
| War Prospects (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                    | Aug. 4   |
| Lord John Russell                                        | Aug. 28  |
| Austria and the War <i>Editorial</i>                     | Sept. 13 |
| The Battle at Chernaya (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>           | Sept. 14 |
| Another British Revelation                               | Sept. 24 |
| The Fall of Sebastopol (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>           | Sept. 28 |
| The Crimean Prospects (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>            | Oct. 1   |
| The Great Event of the War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>       | Oct. 13  |
| The Decay of Religious Authority*                        | Oct. 24  |
| Progress of the War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>              | Nov. 5   |
| The Standing of European Houses*                         | Nov. 9   |
| Lord Derby and His Order*                                | Nov. 14  |
| Germany*                                                 | Nov. 15  |
| The Russian Army (F.E.)                                  | Nov. 16  |
| England*                                                 | Nov. 20  |
| The Loanmongers of Europe*                               | Nov. 22  |
| Prospects of Peace*                                      | Nov. 26  |
| Sardinia*                                                | Nov. 27  |

## 1856

|                                             |         |
|---------------------------------------------|---------|
| The Russian Loan* <i>Editorial</i>          | Jan. 4  |
| Traditional English Policy <i>Editorial</i> | Jan. 12 |
| The Danubian Principalities*                | Jan. 23 |
| The War in Asia (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>     | Jan. 25 |
| The European War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>    | Feb. 4  |
| The Results of the War*                     | Feb. 19 |

|                                                                                        |             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| The Peace in Europe*                                                                   | Feb. 21     |
| (The English-American Conflict—Affairs in France)                                      | Feb. 25     |
| The Fall of Kars                                                                       | April 8     |
| Bonaparteans Victims and Tools                                                         | April 14    |
| European Combinations*                                                                 | April 19    |
| Prussia <i>Editorial</i>                                                               | May 5       |
| Sardinia <i>Editorial</i>                                                              | May 31      |
| The French Credit Mobilier                                                             | June 21, 24 |
|                                                                                        | July 11     |
| (Revolution in Spain) <i>Editorial</i>                                                 | Aug. 8, 18  |
| (The Economic Crisis in Europe) <i>Editorial</i>                                       | Oct. 9      |
| The Monetary Crisis in Europe                                                          | Oct. 15     |
| (The Causes of the Monetary Crisis in Europe)                                          | Oct. 27     |
| (The Monetary Crisis in Europe—The Story of the Circulation of Money) <i>Editorial</i> | Nov. 1      |
| (The Monetary Crisis in France) <i>Editorial</i>                                       | Nov. 22     |
| (The Crisis in Europe) <i>Editorial</i>                                                | Dec. 6      |

## 1857

|                                                                                    |          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| (The Anglo-Prussian War) <i>Editorial</i>                                          | Jan. 7   |
| The Divine Right of the Hohenzollerns                                              | Jan. 9   |
| The Maritime Commerce of Austria                                                   | Jan. 9   |
| (The Anglo-Chinese Conflict) <i>Editorial</i>                                      | Jan. 23  |
| (The Conduct of War in the Mountains, at One Time and Now) (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i> | Jan. 27  |
| (The War Against Persia) <i>Editorial</i>                                          | Feb. 14  |
| (Perspectives of the Anglo-Persian War) (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                    | Feb. 19  |
| The New English Budget                                                             | March 9  |
| Parliamentary Debates on the Chinese Hostilities                                   | March 16 |
| Defeat of the Palmerston Ministry                                                  | March 25 |
| The Coming Elections in England                                                    | March 31 |
| The English Elections                                                              | April 6  |
| (The Russian Trade With China) <i>Editorial</i>                                    | April 7  |
| (English Atrocities in China) <i>Editorial</i>                                     | April 10 |
| The Defeat of Cobden, Bright and Gibson                                            | April 17 |
| (The New English Campaign in China (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                         | April 17 |
| Condition of Factory Laborers                                                      | April 22 |
| Result of the Elections                                                            | April 22 |
| The English Factory System                                                         | April 28 |
| Reforms in the Russian Army (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                | May 6    |
| The British Financial Affairs                                                      | May 16   |
| Credit Mobilier <i>Editorial</i>                                                   | May 30   |
| Credit Mobilier <i>Editorial</i>                                                   | June 1   |
| (The Anglo-Chinese War)* <i>Editorial</i>                                          | June 2   |
| Persia-China (F.E.)                                                                | June 5   |
| Interesting Revelations                                                            | June 12  |
| (The New Law on the Bank of France) <i>Editorial</i>                               | June 20  |
| The Persian Treaty                                                                 | June 24  |
| Revolt in the Indian Army <i>Editorial</i>                                         | July 15  |

|                                                                               |          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| (The Situation in Europe) <i>Editorial</i>                                    | July 27  |
| The Maritime Commerce of Austria*                                             | Aug. 4   |
| The Revolt in India                                                           | Aug. 4   |
| The Indian Question                                                           | Aug. 14  |
| Reports from India                                                            | Aug. 14  |
| State of the Indian Insurrection                                              | Aug. 18  |
| The Oriental Question                                                         | Aug. 27  |
| The Indian Insurrection                                                       | Aug. 29  |
| (The Political Situation in Europe) <i>Editorial</i>                          | Sept. 5  |
| The Revolt in India <i>Editorial</i>                                          | Sept. 15 |
| The Indian Revolt                                                             | Sept. 16 |
| (The Tortures in India) <i>Editorial</i>                                      | Sept. 17 |
| (The British Incomes in India) <i>Editorial</i>                               | Sept. 21 |
| (The French Credit Mobilier) <i>Editorial</i>                                 | Sept. 26 |
| (The Indian Revolt) <i>Editorial</i>                                          | Oct. 3   |
| (The Revolt in India) <i>Editorial</i>                                        | Oct. 13  |
| (The Revolt in India) <i>Editorial</i>                                        | Oct. 23  |
| (The Revolt in India) <i>Editorial</i>                                        | Nov. 14  |
| (The Bank Act of 1844 and the Monetary Crisis in England)<br><i>Editorial</i> | Nov. 21  |
| The British Revulsions                                                        | Nov. 30  |
| (The Capture of Delhi) (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                | Dec. 5   |
| (The Commercial Crisis in England) <i>Editorial</i>                           | Dec. 15  |
| (The Financial Crisis in Europe)                                              | Dec. 22  |
| 1858                                                                          |          |
| (The Crisis in Europe) <i>Editorial</i>                                       | Jan. 5   |
| The French Crisis <i>Editorial</i>                                            | Jan. 12  |
| (The Siege and Assault of Lucknow) (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                    | Jan. 30  |
| The Relief of Lucknow (F.E.)                                                  | Feb. 1   |
| British Commerce                                                              | Feb. 3   |
| The Approaching Indian Loan                                                   | Feb. 9   |
| Windham's Defeat (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                      | Feb. 20  |
| (Attempted Assassination of Bonaparte) <i>Editorial</i>                       | Feb. 22  |
| (The Economic Crisis in France) <i>Editorial</i>                              | March 12 |
| The Rule of the Pretorian                                                     | March 12 |
| (The Derby Ministry—Palmerston's False Resignation) <i>Editorial</i>          | March 15 |
| Portents of the Day                                                           | March 30 |
| Bonaparte's Present Position                                                  | April 1  |
| Pellissier's Mission to England                                               | April 15 |
| The French Trials in London                                                   | April 27 |
| The Fall of Lucknow (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                   | April 30 |
| (The French Financial Situation)                                              | April 30 |
| Mr. Disraeli's Budget                                                         | May 7    |
| The English Alliance                                                          | May 8    |
| Mazzini and Napoleon                                                          | May 11   |
| Important British Documents                                                   | May 20   |
| (Details of the Attack on Lucknow) (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                    | May 25   |

|                                                                                              |            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| The Annexation of Oudh <i>Editorial</i>                                                      | May 28     |
| (The Proclamation of Lord Canning and the Question of Land Tenure in India) <i>Editorial</i> | June 7     |
| (Bonaparte's Financial Maneuvres)                                                            | June 11    |
| (The Revolt in India) (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                | June 15    |
| A Curious Piece of History                                                                   | June 16    |
| The State of British Commerce                                                                | June 21    |
| (Political Parties in England—The Situation in Europe) <i>Editorial</i>                      | June 24    |
| (The British Army in India) (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                          | June 26    |
| The British Government and Slave Trade                                                       | July 2     |
| The Indian Army (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                      | July 21    |
| (The Taxes in India) <i>Editorial</i>                                                        | July 23    |
| The Indian Bill <i>Editorial</i>                                                             | July 24    |
| Imprisonment of Lady Bulwer-Lytton                                                           | Aug. 4     |
| (Poor Houses and Insane Asylums in England) <i>Editorial</i>                                 | Aug. 20    |
| (The British Bank Act of 1844) <i>Editorial</i>                                              | Aug. 23    |
| (Commercial Crisis and the Circulation of Money in England) <i>Editorial</i>                 | Aug. 28    |
| (The History of the Opium Trade) <i>Editorial</i>                                            | Sept. 20   |
| Another Strange Chapter of Modern History                                                    | Sept. 23   |
| (The History of the Opium Trade) <i>Editorial</i>                                            | Sept. 25   |
| (The Revolt in India) (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                | Oct. 1     |
| British Commerce and Finance                                                                 | Oct. 4     |
| (The Anglo-Chinese Treaty) <i>Editorial</i>                                                  | Oct. 5     |
| Mazzini's New Manifesto                                                                      | Oct. 13    |
| The British and Chinese Treaty                                                               | Oct. 15    |
| (The Question of the Abolition of Serfdom in Russia) <i>Editorial</i>                        | Oct. 19    |
| The King of Prussia's Insanity                                                               | Oct. 23    |
| The King of Prussia's Insanity                                                               | Oct. 27    |
| The Prussian Regency                                                                         | Oct. 27    |
| Affairs in Prussia                                                                           | Nov. 3     |
| Russia's Advance into Central Asia (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                   | Nov. 3     |
| Affairs in Prussia                                                                           | Nov. 8     |
| (Address on John Bright)* <i>Editorial</i>                                                   | Nov. 12    |
| (Russia's Success in the Far East) (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                   | Nov. 18    |
| The New Ministry                                                                             | Nov. 24    |
| The Prosecution of Montalembert (F.E.)                                                       | Nov. 24    |
| The New Ministry                                                                             | Nov. 27    |
| (Napoleon III and the Negro Trade)*                                                          | Dec. 1     |
| Affairs in Prussia                                                                           | Dec. 3, 13 |
| (The Plan to Regulate Bread Prices in France) <i>Editorial</i>                               | Dec. 15    |
| (Europe in 1858) (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                     | Dec. 23    |
| (Affairs in Prussia)                                                                         | Dec. 27    |
| 1859                                                                                         |            |
| Question of the Ionian Islands                                                               | Jan. 6     |
| The Excitement in Ireland                                                                    | Jan. 11    |
| The Emancipation Question                                                                    | Jan. 17    |

|                                                                    |          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| (The Question of Italian Unity) <i>Editorial</i>                   | Jan. 24  |
| The War Prospect in Europe                                         | Jan. 31  |
| The Affairs in Prussia                                             | Feb. 1   |
| The Money Panic in Europe (M/E)                                    | Feb. 1   |
| Louis-Napoleon's Position                                          | Feb. 18  |
| The French Army (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                            | Feb. 24  |
| The Austrian Hold on Italy (F.E.)                                  | March 4  |
| The German Resources for War (F.E.)                                | March 12 |
| The State of British Manufactures                                  | March 15 |
| Chances of the Impending War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>               | March 17 |
| The New British Reform                                             | March 17 |
| The State of British Manufactures                                  | March 24 |
| Peace of War <i>Editorial</i>                                      | March 25 |
| A Sigh from the Tuilleries <i>Editorial</i>                        | March 26 |
| The War Prospect in France                                         | March 30 |
| The War Prospect in Prussia                                        | March 31 |
| A Historic Parallel <i>Editorial</i>                               | March 31 |
| The Proposed Peace Congress (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                | April 23 |
| Great Trouble in Indian Finances                                   | April 30 |
| (The Inevitability of War) (F.E.)                                  | April 30 |
| The Proposed Peace Congress                                        | April 30 |
| The War in Europe—Symptoms of its Approach—Germany<br>Arming (M/E) | May 9    |
| The Financial Panic                                                | May 12   |
| Prospects of the War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                       | May 12   |
| Fair Professions <i>Editorial</i>                                  | May 18   |
| The War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                    | May 23   |
| Austria, Prussia and Germany in the War                            | May 27   |
| The War—No Progress (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                        | May 27   |
| Fighting at Last (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                           | June 6   |
| Highly Important from Vienna                                       | June 6   |
| The Battle of Montebello (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                   | June 10  |
| A Prussian View of the War                                         | June 10  |
| Strategy of the War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                        | June 15  |
| Mazzini's Manifesto                                                | June 17  |
| Progress of the War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                        | June 17  |
| The Austrian Defeat (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                        | June 22  |
| British Diplomacy and the War*                                     | July 6   |
| The News from the War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                      | July 8   |
| Historic Justice (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                           | July 21  |
| What Has Italy Gained? <i>Editorial</i>                            | July 27  |
| The Peace <i>Editorial</i>                                         | July 28  |
| The Treaty of Villafranca <i>Editorial</i>                         | Aug. 4   |
| Truth Testified <i>Editorial</i>                                   | Aug. 4   |
| The French Disarmament <i>Editorial</i>                            | Aug. 12  |
| British Commerce <i>Editorial</i>                                  | Aug. 19  |
| Louis-Napoleon and Italy <i>Editorial</i>                          | Aug. 29  |
| Population, Crime and Pauperism                                    | Sept. 16 |
| Present Position of Italy*                                         | Sept. 16 |
| Manufactures and Commerce                                          | Sept. 23 |
| Kossuth and Louis-Napoleon                                         | Sept. 24 |

|                                 |          |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| The New Chinese War             | Sept. 27 |
| The New Chinese War             | Oct. 1   |
| The New Chinese War             | Oct. 10  |
| The New Chinese War             | Oct. 18  |
| Electoral Corruption in England | Nov. 4   |
| A Radical View of the Peace     | Nov. 8   |
| Trouble in Germany              | Dec. 2   |
| Trade with China                | Dec. 3   |
| The Invasion Panic in England   | Dec. 9   |

## 1860

|                                                                                        |             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| The Moorish War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                | Jan. 19     |
| Affairs in France                                                                      | Feb. 2      |
| The Moorish War (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                | Feb. 8      |
| English Politics                                                                       | Feb. 14     |
| The New Treaty Between France and England                                              | Feb. 14     |
| Military Reform in Germany (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                     | Feb. 20     |
| Savoy and Nice (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                 | Feb. 21     |
| The English Budget                                                                     | Feb. 25     |
| The Moorish War (F.E.)                                                                 | March 17    |
| About Rifled Cannon (F.E.)                                                             | I April 7   |
| About Rifled Cannon (F.E.)                                                             | II April 21 |
| About Rifled Cannon (F.E.)                                                             | III May 5   |
| The Public Feeling in Berlin                                                           | April 28    |
| Sicily and the Sicilians <i>Editorial</i>                                              | May 17      |
| Preparations for Napoleon's Coming War on the Rhine                                    | May 19      |
| (Garibaldi in Sicily) Affairs in Prussia                                               | June 14     |
| Garibaldi in Sicily (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                            | June 22     |
| Interesting from Prussia                                                               | June 30     |
| The British Volunteer Troops (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                   | July 11     |
| British Commerce                                                                       | July 16     |
| The State of British Manufacturing Industry                                            | Aug. 6, 24  |
| Interesting from Sicily—Garibaldi's Quarrel with La Farina—<br>A Letter from Garibaldi | Aug. 8      |
| British Defense (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                                | Aug. 10     |
| Could the French Sack London? (F.E.)                                                   | Aug. 11     |
| (Unrest in Syria—English Parliamentary Session—British<br>Commerce)                    | Aug. 11     |
| The Russo-French Alliance                                                              | Aug. 16     |
| The Paper Tax—The Emperor's Letter                                                     | Aug. 22     |
| Garibaldi's Movements (F.E.)                                                           | Aug. 23     |
| (The New Sardinian Loan—The Approaching French and<br>Indian Loans)                    | Aug. 28     |
| The Sick Man of Austria (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                        | Sept. 1     |
| The Crops in Europe                                                                    | Sept. 6     |
| (The Price of Grain—European Finances and War Prepara-<br>tions—The Eastern Question)  | Sept. 10    |
| Garibaldi's Progress (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                           | Sept. 21    |
| Garibaldi in Calabria (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>                                          | Sept. 24    |
| British Commerce                                                                       | Sept. 29    |



|                                            |         |
|--------------------------------------------|---------|
| Russia Using Austria—The Meeting at Warsaw | Oct. 10 |
| Affairs in Prussia                         | Oct. 15 |
| Preparations for War in Prussia            | Nov. 8  |
| A Money Stringency                         | Nov. 24 |

## 1861

|                                                       |         |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Austria—Progress of the Revolution (F.E.)             | Jan. 12 |
| The German Movements (F.E.) <i>Editorial</i>          | Feb. 12 |
| The American Question in England                      | Oct. 11 |
| The British Cotton Trade                              | Oct. 14 |
| The London "Times" and Lord Palmerston                | Oct. 21 |
| The London "Times" on the Orleans Princess in America | Nov. 7  |
| British Commerce                                      | Nov. 23 |
| The Intervention in Mexico                            | Nov. 23 |
| The News and its Effect in London                     | Dec. 19 |
| Progress of Feeling in England                        | Dec. 25 |

## 1862

|                        |          |
|------------------------|----------|
| English Public Opinion | Feb. 1   |
| The Mexican Imbroglia  | March 10 |

WERKE Karl Marx/Frederick Engels. *Werke*. Dietz Verlag Berlin. Vols. I-XXXII, 1958-1965. The German edition of the works of Marx and Engels is based upon the second Russian edition.

CHRONIK Karl Marx. *Chronik seines Lebens in Einzeldaten*. Zusammen- gestellt vom Marx-Engels-Lenin Institut Moskau. Moskau, Marx-Engels Verlag, 1934. 464 p.

RIAZANOV Gesammelte Schriften von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels, 1852-1862. Herausgegeben von N. Rjasanoff. Die Übersetzungen aus dem Englischen von Luise Kautsky. Stuttgart, Dietz, 1917. 2 vols.

### *About the Editor*

---

Henry M. Christman is the editor of twenty books dealing with public affairs, including *One Hundred Years of "The Nation"—A Centennial Anthology, 1865-1965*; *The Public Papers of Chief Justice Earl Warren*; and *Walter P. Reuther—Selected Papers*. Active in many social and reform causes, Mr. Christman is New York State Vice Chairman of Americans for Democratic Action and a Director of the League for Industrial Democracy.



HENRY M. CHRISTMAN is the editor of twenty books dealing with public affairs, including *One Hundred Years of "The Nation"—A Centennial Anthology, 1865–1965*; *The Public Papers of Chief Justice Earl Warren*; and *Walter P. Reuther—Selected Papers*. Active in many social and reform causes, Mr. Christman is New York State Vice Chairman of Americans for Democratic Action and a Director of the League for Industrial Democracy.